DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 193 533 CE 027 096

AUTHOR	Berns, Robert G.; And Others
TITLE	Marketing and Distributive Education: Review and Synthesis of the Research, 1969-1978. Third Edition. Information Series No. 213.
INSTITUTION	ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education, Columbus, Ohio.; Ohio State Univ., Columbus. National Center for Research in Vocational Education.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	80
CONTRACT	400-76-0122
NOTE	140p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Center Publications, The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1960 Kenny Rd., Columbus, OH 43210 ($8.25).
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Curriculum; Curriculum Evaluation; *Distributive Education; Educational Administration; *Educational Objectives; Educational Philosophy; *Educational Research; Employment Opportunities; Human Resources; *Marketing; Models; Program Design; Program Evaluation; School Counseling; *Student Characteristics; Teacher Education; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS	Information Analysis

ABSTRACT

This third edition of a report updates important developments in marketing and distributive education research. Most research studies discussed are from 1968-1978, but several 1979 and 1980 studies are also included. The studies are grouped under the ten main topic areas as follow: philosophy and objectives (historical research, goals and objectives, issues and trends, evaluative criteria); human resource and employment opportunities; learner characteristics (characteristics of high school learners and graduates, postsecondary learners, adult learners, and disadvantaged learners); curriculum (competency identification models, analysis of marketing occupations, middle management retail occupations, postsecondary curriculum research, curricula designed to meet special needs); program design models (non-pay cooperative instruction model, cross-cultural model, simulation model, multipurpose model, cooperative midmanagement model); instruction (project method, cooperative method, training plans, classroom techniques, competency-based instruction, student organization, facilities); guidance and counseling; teacher education (recruitment and admission, preservice teacher candidate personality types, desired behaviors and characteristics of teacher coordinators, inservice teacher education studies); administration and supervision; and evaluation (studies involving measurement of student success, attitudes of students and teachers, program characteristics related to student success, studies involving personal judgment). A summary and analysis of the research and references are also included. (CT)

ED193533

Information Series No. 213

MARKETING AND DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION:
REVIEW AND SYNTHESIS OF THE RESEARCH

1969 - 1978

THIRD EDITION

by

Robert G. Berns
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Blacksburg, Virginia

James L. Burrow
University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa

Harold R. Wallace
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, Colorado

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education
The National Center for Research in Vocational Education
The Ohio State University
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio

1980

CE027096

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE NATIONAL CENTER MISSION STATEMENT

The National Center for Research in Vocational Education's mission is to increase the ability of diverse agencies, institutions, and organizations to solve educational problems relating to individual career planning, preparation, and progression. The National Center fulfills its mission by:

- Generating knowledge through research
- Developing educational programs and products
- Evaluating individual program needs and outcomes
- Providing information for national planning and policy
- Installing educational programs and products
- Operating information systems and services
- Conducting leadership development and training programs

FUNDING INFORMATION

Project Title: ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education

Contract Number: NIE-C-400-76-0122

Educational Act Under Which the Funds were Administered: 41 USC 252 (15) and PL 92-318

Source of Contract:
U.S. Department of Education
National Institute of Education
Washington, D.C.

Contractor:
The National Center for Research in Vocational Education
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

Executive Director: Robert E. Taylor

Project Director: Juliet V. Miller

Disclaimer: This publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Education. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to freely express their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official National Institute of Education position or policy.

Discrimination Prohibited: Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance."
Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving federal assistance." The ERIC Clearinghouse project, like every program or activity receiving financial assistance from the U.S. Department of Education, must comply with these laws.

This publication was prepared with funding from the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Education, under Contract No. NIE-C-400-76-0122. The opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the position or policies of NIE or the Department of Education.

FOREWORD

The Educational Resources Information Center on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education (ERIC/CE) is one of sixteen clearinghouses in a nationwide information system that is funded by the National Institute of Education. One of the functions of the Clearinghouse is to interpret the literature that is entered in the ERIC data base. This paper should be of particular interest to both researchers and practitioners in the field of marketing and distributive education.

The profession is indebted to Drs. Robert Berns, James Burrow, and Harold Wallace for their effort in the preparation of this paper. Recognition also is due Richard Ashmun, The University of Minnesota; G.E. Patterson, The University of South Florida; and Barbara Vorndran, The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, for their critical review of the manuscript prior to its final revision and publication. Robert D. Bhaerman, Assistant Director for Career Education at the ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education, coordinated the publication's development.

Robert E. Taylor
Executive Director
The National Center for Research
in Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

This third edition of a report updates important developments in marketing and distributive education research. Most research studies discussed are from 1968-1978, but several 1979 and 1980 studies are also included. The studies are grouped under the ten main topic areas as follow: philosophy and objectives (historical research, goals and objectives, issues and trends, evaluative criteria); human resource and employment opportunities; learner characteristics (characteristics of high school learners and graduates, postsecondary learners, adult learners, and disadvantaged learners); curriculum (competency identification models, analysis of marketing occupations, middle management retail occupations, postsecondary curriculum research, curricula designed to meet special needs); program design models (non-pay cooperative instruction model, cross-cultural model, simulation model, multipurpose model, cooperative midmanagement model); instruction (project method, cooperative method, training plans, classroom techniques, competency-based instruction, student organization, facilities); guidance and counseling; teacher education (recruitment and admission, preservice teacher candidate personality types, desired behaviors and characteristics of teacher coordinators, inservice teacher education studies); administration and supervision; and evaluation (studies involving measurement of student success, attitudes of students and teachers, program characteristics related to student success, studies involving personal judgment). A summary and analysis of the research and references are also included. (CT)

DESCRIPTORS:: Curriculum Evaluation; *Distributive Education; Educational Administration; *Educational Philosophy, *Educational Research; Employment Opportunities; School Counseling; *Human Resources *Marketing; Program Evaluation; Program Design; *Student Characteristics; Teaching Methods; Teacher Education; Models; Curricula; Educational Objectives

IDENTIFIERS::Information Analysis

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
PHILOSOPHY AND OBJECTIVES	4
HUMAN RESOURCE NEEDS AND EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES	11
LEARNER CHARACTERISTICS	14
CURRICULUM	18
PROGRAM DESIGN MODELS	29
INSTRUCTION	33
GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING	53
TEACHER EDUCATION	56
ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION	72
EVALUATION	75
SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF RESEARCH	97
REFERENCES	107

TABLES

1. DOCTOR'S AND OTHER STUDIES IN MARKETING AND DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION 1968-1980 103

2. REFERENCES MADE TO STUDIES REPORTED BY YEARS AND SUBJECTS 104

3. FREQUENCY WITHIN AREAS OF RESEARCH 106

INTRODUCTION

Throughout recent years, marketing and distributive educators have consistently called for an updated edition of the *Review and Synthesis of Research in Distributive Education*. The contributions of Meyer and Logan (1968), authors of the first edition and Ashmun and Larson (1970), authors of the second edition have been acclaimed as important factors in the development of marketing and distributive education through research. This third edition is intended to supplement those documents and serve to continue the efforts to bring about the better coordination, efficiency, and effectiveness of marketing and distributive education research.

In preparing this document, the authors attempted to summarize and synthesize studies conducted in marketing and distributive education since 1969 in order to provide an overview of the research conducted in certain categories in a way that will be useful to the profession. Those readers interested in categories reported also will find the bibliography of help in identifying studies pertinent to their particular problem or area of interest.

It is important for the reader to consider the following delimitations of this effort. This review includes only those studies about which the reviewers could obtain suitable information within the time and resources available. Although research studies from 1969-1978 were specifically sought and reviewed, a few 1979 and 1980 studies were also obtained in time for inclusion in this document. No claim is made that this review and synthesis is complete.

No attempt was made to evaluate individual studies; however, they were selected for inclusion whenever they met three basic criteria. First, the study must have been subjected to prior review by either a refereed panel of experts, a graduate school committee, or a funding agency monitor. Second, it must have included a research component which identified a specific problem, data to help solve that problem, and findings and conclusions based upon the data. Finally, the study must have been based on a marketing and distributive education topic, using an identifiable marketing and distributive education population. The authors certainly realize that much research has been done in various aspects of education, vocational education (including the use of the cooperative method), and marketing which impacts on marketing and distributive education. However, due to the constraints imposed, such studies could not be included in this document. The reader is encouraged to study other reviews and syntheses in education and vocational education to supplement this information.

In order to identify research completed during the years 1969-1978, the reviewers searched the usual library sources and had ERIC and DATRIX computerized searches conducted. In addition, a mail survey of all marketing and distributive education teacher educators, state supervisors, and state research coordinating unit directors was conducted to locate pertinent research studies. Because of the difficulty in collecting abstracts of masters' studies completed during this time period, the authors regrettably found it necessary to exclude masters' theses from this document.

The reader also should be aware that most information for this review was derived from abstracts rather than completed reports. Although the authors feel it would be helpful for these studies to be evaluated individually and as a whole, the previously mentioned constraints placed upon the authors prevented such an endeavor. However, the final chapter provides general findings of the authors which have emerged from their reviewing and synthesizing of the research. Although trends in research activities and overall information concerning specific research studies may be evident from this document, it is stressed that information about particular studies should not be used as primary sources for citations. The actual studies cited in this review and synthesis should be read completely in order to more accurately evaluate their results, conclusions, and recommendations.

Any undertaking such as this is made possible by the efforts of many individuals and organizations. Special recognition is given to the Council of Distributive Teacher Education, its president Dr. Ray Dannenburg and other officers, and its members, for their support. The marketing and distributive education state supervisors, teacher educators, and the state research coordinating unit directors are thanked for providing copies and abstracts of research

completed. The efforts of Dr. Barry L. Reece, Marketing and Distributive Education Division Representative on the American Vocational Association Editorial and Publications Committee, led to the planning and organization of this endeavor. The authors also express their appreciation to those marketing and distributive educators serving on the committee that reviewed the conceptual framework of this work and provided suggestions for the topical categories, including: Dr. Richard D. Ashmun, Professor Emeritus Lucy C. Crawford, Dr. Vivien K. Ely, Dr. Richard L. Lynch, Professor Emeritus Warren G. Meyer, Dr. Harland E. Samson, and Dr. Gail Trapnell.

PHILOSOPHY AND OBJECTIVES

Only a limited amount of research has been directed toward the study of philosophy and objectives within marketing and distributive education. The research completed has most often been designed to analyze specific populations or structures rather than the broad field of marketing and distributive education. It can be reasonably concluded that the philosophy and objectives of marketing and distributive education have been largely developed and substantiated through the opinions of leaders in the profession.

PHILOSOPHY OF DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION

The most definitive study designed to identify the specific elements of a philosophy of distributive education was completed by Crawford (1967). A variation of the Q-sort methodology was used to determine the basic beliefs of distributive education personnel about the major components of the program. The opinions of a national sample of state supervisors, teachers, and teacher educators were collected and compared to structure a philosophy of distributive education. A high degree of agreement was obtained on ninety-six belief statements grouped within seven elements of the distributive education program. Crawford's philosophical and competency structures have served as the theoretical base for numerous research and curriculum development activities in the profession.

In order to determine whether changes in philosophy had occurred over time, Doonan (1975) compared the philosophy of distributive education leaders in 1976 with that of selected leaders in 1974.

Crawford's (1967) basic belief statements and the same Q-sort methodology were used to determine whether the philosophy of distributive educators had undergone significant change. Those leaders that had been surveyed in the 1965 study were asked to participate and were assigned to categories: those who had retained the same job position and those who had changed job positions. A third category of respondents was identified -- the new personnel hired to replace members of the original group due to normal attrition.

Doonan's (1975) analysis found that no significant change in philosophy had occurred in five of the seven categories of beliefs. In two categories, however, differences were noted. In the objectives category, several changes in the ranking of items in the coordination category made by the 1965 leaders differed on nearly every item from the ranking made by the 1974 personnel.

Doonan concluded that the philosophy of distributive education is changing, although not drastically, over time. There appeared to be more emphasis on the individual students in 1974 than in 1965. Furthermore, there was a philosophy of distributive education that was accepted by leaders in distributive education whether they were actively involved in distributive education in 1965 or not.

A replication of her 1967 philosophy study was completed by Crawford (1975). Drawing opinions from the same populations, she identified 114 basic beliefs which were categorized within seven elements of the distributive education program. Crawford (1975) used the same research design to develop a philosophy of distributive teacher education.

Crawford's (1967) statements of philosophy were used as the base for a study by Kinzer (1969). Participants were selected from the populations of distributive education and business education teachers in New Mexico. They were asked to sort the ninety-six statements into five categories based on the level of agreement or disagreement with each statement. The responses of each group were compared to those of the 172 member panel in the original Crawford research. Kinzer found overall agreement among the three groups in six of the seven categories of beliefs. Slight disagreement was found within the objectives category. Based on the findings, Kinzer recommended that distributive education and business education in New Mexico be combined at the state and local levels. That recommendation was the result of strong support expressed by business educators for the objectives of distributive education.

In order to determine the extent to which program philosophy was being implemented within secondary level programs in Indiana, Davis (1974) used forty-five of Crawford's statements. Statements in the categories of objectives, guidance, curriculum, and coordination were evaluated independently by distributive education teachers and students. Evaluation was based on whether each statement was being achieved, somewhat achieved, or not achieved. Recommendations for improving local programs based on a state philosophy were developed.

Historical Research

Furtado (1973) completed a comprehensive analysis of the development of distributive education during the period of 1936-1972. Documentation of the history of the profession was completed by interviewing thirty-seven individuals selected as a result of their participation in distributive education during three time periods: 1936-1946, the pioneers; 1947-1960, the early implementators; 1961-1972, contemporary leaders. Furtado described and analyzed the development of distributive education using a three dimensional matrix (strategy/structure/systems). Three factors were used in evaluating the growth of the program. The factors were quality, quantity, and equality of programming.

One other historical study was completed during the period of this review. Torres (1979) studied the historical record of distributive education in Puerto Rico from 1898-1972 in order to identify political and economic factors that influenced the development and growth of the program.

Goals and Objectives

A comprehensive set of goals and objectives for distributive education is not evident in the research of the profession. While the literature contains lists of objectives, and there is a great amount of consistency among the lists, and even though Crawford's (1967, 1975) work has been interpreted by some as program objectives, and has provided a data source for research, there is no evidence that the goals or objectives of distributive education have been subjected to rigorous, objective scrutiny on a national level.

Several studies have been completed that have determined the objectives of distributive education at the state level. Decker (1977) used Crawford's (1967) belief statements to compare the attitudes of marketing executives toward the objectives of distributive education with those of secondary school administrators in Arizona. The purpose of the study was to determine the aims, objectives, and needs for distributive education within the state. He discovered that there was no difference between the groups studied regarding their perceptions of need for the program, and only slight differences in the aims and objectives identified. Decker noted a relationship between employers' knowledge of distributive education and the employment opportunities they provided.

Little (1978) sampled secondary level distributive education teachers, coordinators, and directors of vocational education in Michigan to develop objectives and evaluative criteria for programs in the state. Respondents to a survey were asked to identify objectives and evaluative criteria and then rank each item in terms of its relative importance to other items. A final ranking of agreed-upon objectives and evaluative criteria was developed.

Students, instructors, and administrators from nineteen postsecondary schools in New England and retailers familiar with postsecondary retailing programs were surveyed by Ricci (1972). The intent of the study was to identify the level of agreement among the groups on sixty-five statements of belief about retail education. Based on responses, Ricci identified guidelines for the development and improvement of postsecondary retail education programs.

Bradley (1978) used a modified Delphi procedure to identify program and curriculum objectives for postsecondary distributive education programs in Kentucky. Four panels independently analyzed a list of objectives that had been drawn from professional literature and then reviewed by a national panel of experts. Thirty-two statements were accepted as objectives for postsecondary programs. The statements identified ranged widely in terms of clarity and specificity.

Goals and objectives to guide the activities of the National Association of Distributive Education Teachers (NADET) were identified by Christiansen (1977). A research jury composed of twelve past presidents of NADET participated in a Delphi process to determine a set of goal statements and objectives for each goal. The final list of goals and objectives were ranked by a sample of NADET members. Recommendations were made on the use of the goals and objectives in developing a program of work for the organization.

The purpose of a national study by Corbin (1976) was to identify goals and objectives for the high school division of the Distributive Education Clubs of America (DECA). He selected a thirty-member panel of experts composed of distributive education teachers, teacher educators, state supervisors, and national officers of DECA. Using a modified Delphi procedure, the panel evaluated statements representing alternative goals and objectives. An interesting procedure within the study was the use of a lexical analysis expert to help in the evaluation of comments by the panel members. As a result of the research, twelve goals and seventy-two objectives were developed and ranked for the high school division of DECA. A related study was completed by Callahan (1979) to identify the goals for the junior collegiate division of DECA.

Issues and Trends

Three studies were reviewed that analyzed current issues in distributive education. Weatherford (1972) designed a broad study to identify the importance of selected issues, and to develop effective operating procedures in distributive education. Thirty national leaders were selected to participate based on the number of times their names appeared on a leadership questionnaire sent to teacher educators, state supervisors, and teachers. Fifty-two issues statements were identified and categorized. The panel of leaders rated each statement on an importance scale and used a checklist to more clearly define the principle or issue. General agreement was obtained on nineteen of the fifty-two statements.

Reece (1971) and Shoemaker (1973) focused on adult distributive education in two issues studies. Reece reviewed the professional literature from 1960-1968 and developed a list of seventy-seven issues which was refined by a jury of experts into a final list of forty-four items. The final list was then submitted to state supervisors in fifty states and teacher educators in forty-two states for evaluation. Eleven issues were agreed upon by 90 percent of the respondents and were designated by Reece as principles. Seven statements failed to receive a 50 percent level of agreement. Reece concluded that prospective teachers should be prepared to manage adult distributive education programs, that teaching contracts should specify adult education responsibilities, that joint planning of adult programs should occur between secondary and postsecondary personnel, and that states should employ specialists in adult distributive education to assist in program development.

In a similar study, Shoemaker (1973) identified critical issues in adult distributive education within the state of Ohio. He drew from populations of distributive education personnel, adult program administrators, employers, and employees in identifying critical issues in adult distributive education. Shoemaker's recommendations also emphasized the need for teacher preparation and state level leadership in adult distributive education. He also emphasized procedures for effective programming including methods and media, student counseling and placement, and curriculum development.

An interesting assessment of the future of distributive education programs was undertaken by Houstman (1972). He asked all chief state supervisors and teacher educators in distributive education and vocational business education to respond to a sixty-five-item instrument regarding their perceptions of the future of their programs. Among the conclusions of the study, the respondents agreed that there would be increased funding available and the primary objective of the programs would continue to be to develop vocationally competent students. The use of cooperative education within programs was identified as the most effective method of gaining occupational competence, and education at the elementary school level should stress careers in marketing and distribution.

Job placement of graduates was seen as an important future activity to be conducted within secondary schools. Work experience would be necessary for the certification of teachers, and internships would replace the traditional student teaching experience for prospective distributive education teachers.

Evaluative Criteria

The development of evaluative standards and criteria within distributive education is closely related to the philosophy of the profession. Philosophy is translated into evaluative standards to be used in assessing program quality.

The philosophy of distributive teacher education developed by Crawford (1975) was used to develop evaluative standards and criteria by the Council for Distributive Teacher Education (CDTE). A national teacher education conference was convened in 1976 to begin the process of development. Work at the conference resulted in an initial draft of fifty-five standards and 219 criteria for distributive teacher education programs. Strydesky (1977) validated the standards and criteria using a geographically stratified random national sample of thirty teacher educators. Each of the standards and criteria was evaluated on three criteria: feasibility, adequacy, and representativeness. After completion of six rounds of a Delphi procedure, fifty standards and 189 criteria were considered to have a sufficient degree of concurrence to be acceptable to the profession. The standards and criteria are being field tested to determine their usefulness in evaluating teacher education programs.

Standards and criteria for the evaluation of secondary distributive education programs have been included as "Section 4-4, Distributive Education" in Evaluative Criteria for the Evaluation of Secondary Schools published by the National Study of Secondary School Evaluation (1969). In a project directed by Harris (1978) within the U.S.O.E. Region V, specific evaluative criteria were developed to be used in interpreting the standards published by NSSE. Whitted (1969) validated standards and criteria for the evaluation of postsecondary programs. The results included an instrument that could be used in program evaluation.

Summary

In reviewing the research related to philosophy and objectives, it can be concluded that a common philosophy exists within the profession. That philosophy can be identified through the basic beliefs of Crawford's research. That research has been used within many other studies and has been largely confirmed in each succeeding effort.

There has been little if any research effort to identify specific program goals and objectives to guide the profession. Most researchers have used Crawford's basic beliefts to represent the objectives of marketing and distributive education.

It is important to note the development of evaluative criteria for secondary and postsecondary programs as well as for teacher education during this period. Those criteria should provide an important base for future evaluation efforts [illegible] marketing and distributive education.

HUMAN RESOURCE NEEDS AND EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

There is little evidence within distributive education research that program development has been based on a careful assessment of human resource needs. A significant effort has been directed toward identifying the skills or competencies needed for successful employment in marketing occupations which certainly is an important element in meeting such needs. But very few of those studies examined the demand for trained persons in the occupations studied.

Certainly a great amount of employment data is available for use by program planners. Specifically, the Federal Departments of Labor and Commerce, as well as other bureaus and offices of the federal government collect, analyze, and distribute human resource and employment data through a variety of publications. State governmental agencies also analyze and report employment data on a regular basis. No attempt will be made within this report to review those sources.

There is a major emphasis within vocational education philosophy on the need to analyze employment data carefully as program-related decisions are made. It is hoped and presumed that distributive educators are, in fact, collecting and using national, state, and local employment data even though there is little evidence of that activity in the research reviewed.

Four studies were located which specifically collected and analyzed employment data as a part of broader curriculum research. Those studies are discussed in the Curriculum section of this paper as well.

Samson (1969) critically examined the human resource needs and employment characteristics of department store middle managers in the North Central United States. The research questions sought answers which would contribute to describing the department store middle manager. Information collected included the duties and responsibilities, desired characteristics, and educational preparation desired of middle management personnel; the number of middle management positions that existed in department stores; and the projected need for middle management personnel in the next decade. Structured interviews with executives and middle management personnel were used. Among the conclusions, Samson reported that the average ratio of middle managers to other store personnel was approximately one to eleven. Middle managers made up 8.3 percent of the work force in the businesses studied.

In projecting demand for middle managers, Samson identified an average turnover rate in the firms studied of 14.7 percent. In addition to the demand created by turnover, 43 percent of store executives anticipated an increased demand over the next ten year period. It was determined in the study that 68 percent of middle managers were recruited from internal sources.

Devitt and Leonard (1977) compared employment data in Indiana with the career objectives and cooperative method placements of distributive education students. The Indiana Employment Security Division provided data on current job demand and 1980 anticipated market projections for occupational areas represented in the distributive education curriculum.

Both Gildan (1977) and Patton (1971) identified employment potential for select populations in studies designed to aid in curriculum development. Gildan surveyed Florida business people to identify the jobs within distributive occupational areas that could be satisfactorily held by persons with mental handicaps. They indicated that most of the educable mentally handicapped (EMH) employed by businesses in the past performed stockroom and janitorial duties with only a few performing in the area of sales and other jobs. It was further noted that although a majority of employers were willing to hire slow learners in their businesses, 75 percent of the employers indicating willingness to hire slow learners were not employing them at the time of the survey. Patton asked business persons from urban areas in Oklahoma to predict employment opportunities for middle managers in selected distributive occupational areas.

A unique and useful study for those persons using human resource data in program planning was completed by Eggland (1974). In the study he identified a model for relating postsecondary program development in Nebraska to anticipated employment needs. Eggland collected employment projections from six data sources: Nebraska distributive business persons, seniors in Nebraska high schools, distributive education teachers, a distributive education state program consultant, Nebraska Department of Labor, and the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. A seventh potential source, state and national trade associations, was unable to provide useful employment data.

Using the data sources, Eggland structured six hierarchies of need by the U.S.O.E. distributive education instructional program areas. A weighted hierarchy combining the rankings of all six data sources was also developed. In addition to recommendations regarding postsecondary distributive education program development in Nebraska, Eggland suggested that the model be used to aid program development decisions in other occupational areas. It appears that the model could be rather easily used by state and local decision makers.

LEARNER CHARACTERISTICS

Crawford (1975) found that professionals in marketing and distributive education indicated that the program should serve people of diverse talents, abilities, interests, and backgrounds who want and can benefit from the instruction. Although the variable, learner characteristics, has been used in various studies to classify learners for the purpose of comparing their attitudes, beliefs, competencies, etc., few investigations focused on learner characteristics as the primary variable of interest. The research conducted over the past ten years which focused on marketing and distributive education learner characteristics may be categorized under the following topics: high school learner characteristics, high school graduate characteristics, postsecondary learner characteristics, adult learner characteristics, and disadvantaged learner characteristics.

High School Learner Characteristics

Crawford (1975) reported that supervisors and teacher educators believed that all applicants for the distributive education program should be carefully considered to assure the inclusion of those students who can and sincerely wish to profit from instruction. In an attempt to identify predictive variables that could be used to determine the probable occupational success of a student desiring to enter the distributive education program, Moores (1974) studied the distributive education enrollment (120 students) in one large metropolitan high school in Virginia. Using a regression formula, she found that the best single variate predictor was the distributive education classroom grade (based upon the project plan) and the best multivariate prediction formula was: distributive education classroom grade (0.176223) + distributive education achievement test score (as measured by the Hoffman (1968) Marketing and Distribution Test for Distributive Education students) (0.34406) + English grade point average (0.33496).

Also at the high school level, Harris (1971) investigated the perceptions of employers regarding the personal characteristics needed by high school students in the distributive education program using the cooperative method. He then compared the employers' perceptions with the teacher coordinators' perceptions of the personal characteristics actually demonstrated by distributive education students. Fourteen personal characteristics were identified, and analysis of data revealed that employers desired all fourteen characteristics to be at a higher level than that which distributive education students possessed.

High School Graduate Characteristics

Harris also determined the personal characteristics needed by distributive education high school graduates and the actual characteristics possessed by graduates. Again, data showed that employers desired full-time employees to have all fourteen of the personal characteristics at a higher level than was demonstrated by distributive education graduates. Perhaps of more significance was the finding that eleven of the fourteen characteristics should be demonstrated at a significantly higher level by graduates of distributive education programs than by students just entering the cooperative distributive education program. Teacher coordinators surveyed indicated that the needed personal characteristics were developed by their students.

Lundell (1975) also studied high school distributive education graduates. The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between twenty-seven characteristics of 1968 Minnesota distributive education graduates with their program experiences and their educational and occupational status five years after high school graduation. One conclusion reached in this study was that none of the twenty-seven student and program variables could be used to identify the type of student most likely to persist and be satisfied in a marketing occupation. However, when comparing the job satisfaction of the employed distributive education graduates with that of the general worker population identified in an earlier study, distributive education graduates had significantly more extrinsic job satisfaction at $P<.02$. Therefore, it was concluded that the program characteristics of distributive education helped the graduates become employed and find job satisfaction in related or unrelated occupations. In a related study, Boucher (1977) surveyed distributive education graduates in order to assess the personal/social adjustment needs of students in distributive education programs in Louisiana in relation to job choice and job satisfaction.

Postsecondary Learner Characteristics

At the postsecondary level, Allen (1971) identified, analyzed, and compared the self concept scores, cognitive style fluency and flexibility scores, and Scholastic Aptitude Test scores of distributive education majors in two-year terminal programs with other curriculum majors in transfer programs in three junior colleges in Georgia. Significant differences were identified on the four cognitive variables between the two curriculum groups. The distributive education two-year terminal group scored significantly higher on cognitive style fluency and cognitive style flexibility, and the transfer group scored significantly higher on the Scholastic Aptitude Test (Verbal) and Scholastic Aptitude Test (Quantitative) at the .05 level of significance.

Adult Learner Characteristics

In an adult education study, Sita (1974) analyzed relationships between adult distributive education students' perceptions of program adequacy and their personal, educational, and occupational characteristics. Arizona community college administrators identified the sample. Among the findings of the study were that adult distributive education students were more likely to be male, single, white, and working part- or full-time. Furthermore, they were likely to have had average or above average academic achievements and were likely to have gone on in advanced education.

Disadvantaged Learner Characteristics

Senning (1972) studied factors contributing to the enrollment of disadvantaged learners in junior college marketing and related management programs. Disadvantaged learners and business firms were surveyed to determine the perceptions held by each group toward the employment of disadvantaged junior college graduates.

Gildan (1977) researched the unique characteristics and needs, asipirations, and abilities of the educable mentally handicapped student and matched these characteristics with careers in marketing which an industry survey indicated were reasonable expectations. Among other findings reported in the curriculum and manpower needs sections of this work, she reported that wide discrepancies existed between what the employers claimed educable mentally handicapped learners could do and what the special education teachers said they could do.

CURRICULUM

Curriculum research and development has been a predominant activity within marketing and distributive education during the time under study. More than in any other area of research with the profession, there has been a consistent focus and design.

The basic structure of marketing and distributive education curriculum has evolved from a conceptual model presented by Nelson at the 1963 National Clinic on the Implementation of Vocational Education in Distribution. The model identified four occupational competency areas within the discipline of distribution: social skills, basic skills, product or service technology, and marketing skills. In addition to the four competency areas, Nelson identified the need for instruction about the free, competitive enterprise system.

In a U.S. Office of Education publication by Brown (1969), Distributive Education in the High School, the model presented by Nelson was refined and a curriculum outline for analysis of distributive occupations was presented. In that outline, three career levels of distributive occupations were described: basic jobs, career development jobs, and specialist jobs.

That basic curriculum model was modified slightly in a U.S.O.E. publication by Ely (1978), Distributive Education Programs. The revised model described five competency areas. In addition to the four areas described in the 1969 publication, economic concepts of private enterprise was included as a competency area rather than as a broad area of instruction. Four employment levels were described: threshold, career sustaining, specialization, and entrepreneur. The scope of distributive education curriculum was identified through twenty-two instructional program codes.

Competency Identification Model

A consistent pattern of curriculum research and development has emerged in distributive education. Competency identification has become the base for much of the curriculum development efforts during the ten-year period. Surveys, personal interviews with business persons, and observations of workers have been the primary methods of data collection.

Curriculum research in distributive education has increasingly focused on occupational clusters and broad competency areas. The work of Ertel (1966) and Crawford (1967) initiated the analysis of jobs within occupational clusters in distributive education. The theoretical structure of those studies as well as the competencies identified have been incorporated into numerous subsequent research and development activities.

Ertel (1966) surveyed supervisory and nonsupervisory personnel in three categories of retail businesses to determine the tasks and related knowledges needed for successful employment. Crawford's (1967) research analyzed the skills, knowledge, and attitudes needed by workers in the occupations found within seven clusters of businesses. The competencies identified were classified in the following major competency areas: advertising, display, human relations, communications, mathematics, merchandising, operations and management, product or service technology, and selling.

The competency-pattern approach designed by Crawford was utilized to develop a computerized, competency-based instructional system for distributive education. Harrison (1973) directed an eleven-state consortium in the development and testing of 500 learning activity packages. The contents of the instructional packages were based on the 983 competencies identified by Crawford. A three-year development and testing process was completed involving nearly 200 distributive education teachers and 7,000 students. A computer-assisted management system was designed to aid teachers in organizing instruction based on the career objectives of students. Research related to the instructional system developed by the Interstate Distributive Education Curriculum Consortium (IDECC) is discussed in other sections of this book.

Analysis of Marketing Occupations

Because of the attention focused on the use of competency-based instructional systems, a significant number of studies have been completed that identified and analyzed the tasks needed for successful employment in specific marketing occupations. Populations surveyed, methodology, and level of specification of tasks varied considerably among the studies. Many of the studies built on the early work of Crawford, but there appears to be some additional effort to base recent competency research on prior, related studies.

Competency research within distributive education has most often focused on one occupational cluster or one competency area of the curriculum. However, a few recent efforts have analyzed many or all of the occupational program areas associated with the distributive education curriculum.

Within a comprehensive curriculum planning process, Lynch and Kohns (1977) described a theoretical framework for distributive education curriculum development as a prelude to the analysis of occupations in nineteen instruction program areas as identified by the United States Office of Education at the time of the study. Curriculum decisions, according to Lynch and Kohns, must be based on an analysis of the instructional areas, the occupational subclusters, and the employment levels represented within distributive education.

Based on that theory, they developed broad content outlines for each of the nine instructional programs. Content was structured using competencies needed by workers in three employment levels: entry, midmanagement, and manager/owner. Objectives were classified within five instructional areas: marketing, product or service technology, social skills, basic skills, and economic principles/concepts.

Initial listings of competencies were synthesized from interviews with business personnel and relevant literature including the major competency identification studies completed in distributive education. Statements of terminal and enabling objectives were written and verified through review by subcluster consultants and business persons representing the three employment levels in each instructional program area.

In a multiyear developmental project, Harris (1978) prepared curriculum guides for marketing and distributive education program areas. In the research completed to support curriculum development, competencies essential for the most common entry level jobs in each occupational area were identified. In addition, the most common career ladders and most important criteria for promotion were identified. Following a literature review to develop an initial list of competencies, a jury of business executives from each occupational area reviewed the lists and provided necessary career information. Finally, selected distributive education teachers conducted structured interviews with persons employed in the identified entry level positions to verify the competency lists.

The Interstate Distributive Education Curriculum Consortium (IDECC) initiated a procedure in 1979 to update and extend its competency-based curriculum. Williams et al. (1979) developed a standard task inventory process to be used in all future curriculum development activities of the Consortium. The procedure was subsequently used to validate tasks in sixteen general merchandising department store occupations. After review by an advisory committee of six department store executives, the task lists were validated through surveys of supervisors and employees in thirty states. Additional occupational areas are being analyzed using the same procedures as a part of IDECC's ongoing curriculum development process.

A broad-based vocational education competency identification process was initiated by the Vocational-Technical Education Consortium of States (1978). Seventeen states have joined in an effort to develop competency-based instructional systems and avoid duplication of efforts. A carefully designed set of methods and procedures is used in all task analysis efforts and the results of each study are published in a catalog of performance objectives and criterion-referenced measures. In addition, performance guides are written in order to aid in the evaluation of performance tasks.

Several studies have centered on competencies needed in jobs related to only one occupational area. Again, specific procedures varied, but all used persons employed in the occupation as a primary data source.

Patterson (1974) combined interviews with supervisors and employees and observations of employee performance to identify competencies needed by hotel/motel room clerks and cashiers. The study used small samples of personnel from nine hotels in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania to verify competencies that were initially identified by experts in hotel management.

A second study of occupations in the hotel industry was completed by Malina (1978). Case interviews were conducted with employees and supervisors in Waikiki, Hawaii, to determine performance requirements for twenty-four job titles. Critical incident reports were collected from supervisors in order to develop effective and ineffective performance indicators and to describe the social criteria for jobs. Data were organized into a system of thirteen basic work component categories. As a result of the research, a Modern Office and Distributive Education Learning System (MODELS) was developed.

In a detailed analysis of the tourism industry in Florida, Dietrich (1976) used a conceptual structure similar to that of Crawford. In order to establish a theoretical framework to guide the development of curriculum, Dietrich identified ninety-three concepts and generalizations concerning marketing and economics and then developed a mission statement for the tourism industry. Using that theoretical base, a competency identification and classification process was completed using interviews with employees and supervisors. A total of 9,144 competencies were identified.

Devitt and Leonard (1977) designed a process for matching curriculum development in Indiana to the career objectives of distributive education students and state employment needs. High school distributive education students were surveyed to determine career objectives and current job titles of those employed. That information was matched against current and projected state employment data. The second major project activity tested the reliability of Crawford's (1967) competency study and the task lists for marketing occupations developed by V-TECS. Currently employed cashier/checkers in selected supermarkets in Indianapolis were surveyed to verify the competencies. Domain matrices were developed for seven occupational subclusters using the Crawford and V-TECS competencies.

The Division of Vocational Education of the Ohio State Department of Education sponsored a project in 1975 to develop the occupational analysis skills of vocational education teachers. As a part of that project, several distributive occupations were analyzed to determine tasks, tools and equipment needed, procedural knowledge, safety procedures, and the importance of math, communications, and science concepts within each occupation. The occupations analyzed included:

Real Estate by Harestad and others
Automobile Sales by Bohac and Vernon
Insurance Sales by Moore and others
Automotive Service by Winfrey and Morse
Industrial Sales by Kitzmiller and others
Auto Parts Counterperson by Christ and Deluzin

In other competency identification studies that focused on marketing occupations Jacobs (1978) studied the occupation of manufacturer's salesperson; James (1978) analyzed the most common first level positions in food marketing, general retail merchandising and wholesaling; and Pope (1976) studied twenty jobs in the field of fashion. Each of the studies was based on data collected from business persons although procedures differed in each study. Other related studies included competency identification in agribusiness occupations by Yoder and McCracken (1975), Edwards and others (1975), Berger and Lokai (1976), and Golden (1970).

Middle Management Retail Occupations

Four studies looked specifically at the middle level of management in retail stores. Carmichael (1968) developed a taxonomy of 202 activities performed by middle managers in department, variety, and discount retail stores. The taxonomy was based on the relative importance, cruciality to success, and frequency of performance for each activity. He found that management activities are most crucial to job success, but that basic marketing skills are necessary for lower management jobs. Differences in activities performed were noted by store type and by level of management.

Samson (1969) interviewed a sample of managers from retail department stores in the East North Central region of the United States in order to describe their characteristics, duties, and educational needs. In addition to developing a detailed description of the nature of retail midmanagement, Samson used a Q-sort methodology to determine the relative importance of thirty characteristics of middle management personnel, and to identify the ideal training source for each of the characteristics.

Middle Management Curriculum

Ball (1970) in a study patterned after the Samson (1969) research, compared the perceptions of postsecondary marketing educators and department store executives from four midwest states. The specific purpose of the study was to determine the degree of agreement between the groups on the skills, knowledge, and attitudes needed by middle management personnel, and where and how training could best be attained. Using thirty competency statements, Ball found significant disagreement on two statements when determining the importance of each competency. In analyzing appropriate sources of training, the two groups disagreed on five of the statements.

Kirk (1969) also compared the opinions of educators and business persons regarding middle management training. Using samples of Florida business people and marketing educators, Kirk found significant differences in the ratings of skills, knowledge, and attitudes deemed important for middle management personnel. However, ratings of personal characteristics were very similar between groups.

Content Areas

Subject matter within the distributive education curriculum has been an historic research interest. Such studies have increasingly focused on competency identification although a few have identified broad concepts. Most of the studies reviewed were limited to selected occupational categories and/or specific geographical areas.

McAnelly (1977) studied the mathematics competencies needed by employees in major retail businesses in Chicago. Shell (1979) identified entry-level computational skills in general merchandise occupations by surveying employees in metropolitan areas within Ohio, Kentucky, and Tennessee.

Sedlik (1973) focused on the marketing research competencies important to middle management personnel in Illinois. The competencies were identified by personnel in general merchandising, finance and credit, apparel and accessories, and food distribution occupations, and then ranked according to importance for initial employment and job advancement.

The perceptions of New Mexico students, teachers, and employers were compared by Palmore (1972) using a Q-sort of seventy-five competency statements. The statements described specific competencies considered important in selling occupations.

One study was found that examined the economics curriculum component. In a comprehensive study of all U.S.O.E. distributive education program code areas, Eggland (1976) identified economic competencies required of employed persons. Economic concepts and understandings considered important by economists and economics teachers were translated into competency statements. The statements were than analyzed by over 200 business persons in the Midwest through structured interviews. Hierarchies of economic competencies were identified for each U.S.O.E. program code and a cumulative ranking of fifty-six competency statements was derived.

In order to assess the coverage given to marketing concepts with the IDECC LAPs, Samson and Rathert (1976) completed a two-part study. Initially they surveyed a sample of business persons representing all nineteen U.S.O.E. occupational program codes to identify the level of importance attached to sixteen basic marketing concepts. Following that identification, selected distributive education teachers reviewed the IDECC LAPs to determine where and to what extent coverage was given to each concept. As a result of the review, the researchers recommended that LAPs be developed for all concepts except Risk (already covered) and GNP (not considered an important concept).

Postsecondary Curriculum Research

Much of the curriculum research completed during the period being reviewed had applications for secondary and postsecondary programs. However, a few research efforts specifically analyzed middle level management positions and others examined postsecondary program models. The competency studies of Carmichael (1968), Samson (1969), and Sedlik (1973) reviewed earlier were based only on midmanagement occupations.

In a national study by Fishco (1976) the perceptions of top level managers in retail stores were compared with those of employment executives regarding the training needs of midmanagement personnel. Participants were selected from 100 major department stores as listed in Stores magazine. They were asked to evaluate eighty-one informational topics and twenty-nine broad competencies that might be included in community college retail education programs. A majority of respondents ranked sixty-nine topics and twenty-seven competencies as either essential or important. The two most important areas of training identified were supervision and leadership development.

Executives and midmanagers from large and small retail stores in Massachusetts were used by LaSalle (1973) to develop a community college retail curriculum for the state. Thirty competencies were analyzed using a Q-sort process. In addition, desired personal qualities of midmanagers were identified.

Patton (1971) examined nine occupational areas in order to improve the curriculum development process for postsecondary programs in Oklahoma. Structured interviews with business persons were conducted to determine differences in the preemployment training needs of middle managers for the occupational areas studies. Curriculum areas considered most important in midmanagement training were human relations, buying, salesmanship, sales management, math, accounting, psychology, and budget planning. Patton recommended that students should be counseled toward specific courses with a midmanagement curriculum rather than designing specialized programs for unique occupational areas.

Leventhal (1970) completed a study of the curricula of forty-eight two-year postsecondary marketing and distributive education programs in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York. He reported that an average of sixty-four semester credits were needed for an associate degree; twenty-six credits in general education, and thirty-six credits of marketing and business subjects were required in the average program. Curricula were most often general rather than specialized, and were subject-centered. There appeared to be little evidence of curriculum planning or the use of advisory committees in most programs. Based on the results of the study, Leventhal proposed a two-year postsecondary marketing curriculum.

Curricula Designed to Meet Special Needs

Examples exist within distributive education of curricula developed as a result of the identification of the need for marketing instruction for special populations. Three projects were reviewed that were designed to develop and evaluate specialized curriculum materials.

Cook and others (1970) tested a one-year intensive curriculum to develop entry level employment skills for Detroit high school seniors who had no prior business skills. Employment skills common to entry level retailing and office occupations were used. The performance of students participating in the intensified curriculum were compared with that of students in traditional distributive and office education programs by interviewing employers of graduates from both types of programs. No significant differences were noted in employer ratings of students from the two groups, and employers were satisfied with the performance of students from both programs. An interesting conclusion by the project directors was that few specific skills were needed for entry level retailing and office jobs.

Gildan (1977) surveyed Florida business persons in order to match the needs, aspirations, and abilities of EMH students with industry expectations for careers in marketing and distribution. After the identification of appropriate jobs and the development of task lists, LAPs were selected from the IDECC system to provide instruction for selected students. Gildan concluded that the LAPs as presently constructed were unsatisfactory for use with mainstreamed EMH students in distributive education programs.

In order to provide career information to students participating in a motivation program in Philadelphia high schools, Weber (1979) designed several marketing career booklets. Booklets were prepared in the areas of advertising, fashion, management, recreation and tourism, retailing, and hotel/motel operations. In surveys taken following the use of the career booklets, participants showed no greater interest in distributive careers than persons who had not read the booklets.

Miller (1969) surveyed supervisors of disadvantaged retail employees in Columbus, Ohio, to determine critical employment requirements. Supervisors attached greater importance to attitudes and human relations skills than to specific skills and knowledges. Absenteeism and lack of communications skills contributed most to negative incidents whereas willingness to work and interest in the job were positive elements. Overall, however, more positive than negative incidents were reported.

Summary

A consistent conceptual basis for curriculum development was evident in the research completed during the ten-year period under review. The marketing and distributive education curriculum is structured with five competency areas and is based upon broad occupational categories.

Competency-based curriculum development has become a common practice within the profession. Competencies and tasks are most often identified by surveying supervisors and by studying persons employed directly in the occupations being studied to determine their opinions. Only limited attention has been given to methods of data collection other than surveys, card sorts, or structured interviews.

The data identified through several research projects have served as a basis for later studies. Most notably, the work of Ertel (1966), Crawford (1967), Carmichael (1968), Samson (1969), and Eggland (1976), have been incorporated into succeeding studies.

Comprehensive national curriculum research is limited, and there is evidence of some duplication of effort, as well as of concentration of activity in selected occupational areas. Curriculum projects such as those completed by the Interstate Distributive Education Curriculum Consortium and the Illinois State Curriculum Guides illustrate that much of the research completed has served as a basis for curriculum development.

The identification of tasks and competencies required of workers in several employment levels would aid in the articulation of instruction between high school, postsecondary, and adult programs.

PROGRAM DESIGN MODELS

Guidelines for developing and operating marketing and distributive education programs are widely available as operation manuals and curriculum guides. Several of these documents that were developed on the basis of research were found in this review of literature. These investigations at some stage employed a data base to help with the design or implementation guidelines for some aspect of the marketing and distributive education program.

Nonpay Cooperative Instruction Model

Allen (1977) investigated the nonpay approach to distributive education as it was implemented in West Virginia. The purpose of the study was to determine student, teacher, and training sponsor reactions to the nonpay approach and also to discover the most common problems encountered in its implementation. To gather data for this investigation, sixty teacher coordinators were asked to evaluate the implementation of the nonpay approach by responding to a questionnaire.

It was found that twenty had actually implemented nonpay cooperative instruction in their programs. Those who had done so were asked to select two students at random to complete a student questionnaire. In addition, the training sponsor of each student was asked to complete a questionnaire. Included in the findings were the following observations. The average amount of time spent by students on the job under the nonpay concept was six weeks. Typically, six to ten students were employed without pay in the programs where this approach was used. Major benefits to the student were reported as improvements in self confidence and increased sense of responsibility. The teacher coordinators' attitudes to nonpay cooperative instruction were highly favorable, with 95 percent indicating approval. It should be noted that these coordinators represented the approximately one-third who were involved in using the concept. The training sponsor attitudes were also favorable with 75 percent indicating that nonpay on-the-job training was a satisfactory experience for the employer and for participating students. Apparently most students felt that they had benefited from the experience of working without pay and that they had not been exploited. Overall, this investigation appears to provide evidence for the support and expansion of nonpay cooperative instruction in distributive education.

Cross Cultural Model

A model for distributive education was developed by Shapiro (1973) on the basis of information gathered in a cross-cultural study of distributive education programs in the U.S. (mostly in New York) and comparable programs in England. A descriptive survey was used to gather information about programs in both countries. The result of the investigation was a model program for distributive education incorporating the best that was found in both approaches. The final model was viewed by the researcher as providing a "curriculum sufficiently structured for comprehensive training but flexible enough to meet individual needs." The project method was an important aspect of the model that finally emerged. Three student options were included: a "Grade Distribution Certificate" course for students who intended to enter employment immediately upon graduation from high school, another certificate program with cooperative experience for the individual who was undecided about future employment or college, and a course including special projects for college-bound students who expected to prepare for management positions in marketing and distribution.

Simulation Model

A model program for rural schools, using simulation instead of cooperative instruction, was developed by Crawford (1976) in the state of Virginia. The document describing the model program presented a prototype of job training plans developed as part of a research project which pilot-tested a distributive education program for rural schools utilizing a retail store simulation. The plans were for fifteen entry level and fifteen career level jobs in seven categories of distributive business.

Multipurpose Model

Elias and Reece (1978) developed a model for distributive education for use in the area vocational schools of Missouri. The procedure for model development included a review of literature on specialized programs and data gathered from the fifty-two programs in that state. A task force composed of business people, school administrators, and distributive education personnel visited the schools and gathered information using a structured interview instrument that had been developed to analyze the operation of a distributive education program. Data from the study along with information from a literature review were synthesized and used to design the model. The results of the study were used to produce models for use in schools located in large metropolitan areas, schools of smaller size in suburban communities, and isolated rural schools.

Cooperative Midmanagement

Basseri (1970) developed a design for cooperative merchandising midmanagement training in California. In order to develop this design, literature of the field was surveyed to identify critical needs in cooperative merchandising midmanagement training. This information was used to develop an inquiry form which embodied what was believed to constitute the job requirements of a merchandising midmanagerial position. Through structured interviews with executive personnel in merchandising establishments who supervised midmanagers, and midmanagers who occupied such positions, data for this investigation were obtained. The midmanagers and their supervisors were asked to comment on whether they thought the information and competencies described in the inquiry were appropriate and whether they should be taught in distributive education. The results of the investigation were a suggested curriculum, course outlines, and other supporting forms.

LABORATORY EXPERIENCE MODEL

Lancaster (1972) developed a model for facilities and for laboratory experiences in junior college distributive education. The model was developed on the basis of information obtained through an extensive literature search. This information was used in the design of a questionnaire to determine whether the criteria, as found in the literature, were desirable and workable. The investigation included an evaluation of the facilities model by using a panel of experts. The results indicated that the model was appropriate and workable.

INSTRUCTION

Studies involving the learning process and teaching methodology varied considerably in relation to research topics, types, and designs. Observations, mail surveys, interviews, and quasi-experimental studies were conducted which attempted to explore such areas as the project and cooperative methods of instruction, classroom techniques, competency-based instruction, student organization, facilities and equipment, and measurement of learner achievement.

Instructional Methodology

Most studies of instructional methodology in distributive education have examined distributive education programs that used either the cooperative plan or the project plan. Although the project plan (method) has been examined in various studies, only one investigation was found which attempted to compare the effectiveness of the two plans. Rowe (1969) compared the achievement of eleventh and twelfth grade high school distributive education students who received instruction through the project method with that of twelfth grade distributive education students who received instruction through the cooperative method. He reported that the twelfth grade students taught by the cooperative method tended to reflect greater growth in economic understanding than did the eleventh and twelfth grade students taught by the project method.

Project Method

In an attempt to determine whether the project method is accomplishing the goal of training students to enter marketing without the benefit of on-the-job training, Thrash (1970) tested students who had experienced project method training and those without such experience to determine differences in their rate of achievement in three content areas. No significant differences were found.

Crawford (1976) developed and tested a program of simulated occupational experiences for students in rural communities where the cooperative method was not feasible. Distributive education programs in four Virginia high schools were used to test the program. In-school laboratory experiences were based upon the curriculum content suggested for first and second year cooperative students in Virginia. The evaluation consisted of a self-evaluation by the teacher coordinators and administrators of the schools, an evaluation by the project director, and an evaluation by a team of out-of-state experts. The general plan of the program was found to be a feasible alternative for schools in areas where cooperative method programs could not be accommodated.

Cooperative Method

Several studies were conducted that related to training station utilization in programs using the cooperative method. The coordination phase of the teacher coordinator's role is reviewed in the Teacher Education section. It is apparent, however, that investigators did not build upon other research in this area. Harris (1971) identified major problems faced by employers and teacher-coordinators that limited the effectiveness of the cooperative plan. He also determined the reasons for business participation in the program. Berkowitz (1974) investigated part-time versus alternate week work schedules as an influence on the educational progress and attitudes of New York City high school cooperative distributive education students. Educational progress was measured by students' attendance, and by their goals in English, social studies, distributive education, and their job rating grades. The attitudes of the students toward school environment, the job, and themselves since entering distributive education were also determined. Evidence did not suggest that a particular cooperative schedule had a consistent effect or even a major effect on academic progress. The investigator did nevertheless detect a more positive influence on attitudes from the alternate week group than from the part-time group, espectially as the attitudes pertained to school, classmates, and teachers.

Morgan (1977) sought to determine whether students who were more similar to their training sponsors, as indicated by a comparison of specific work attitudes and personality factors, achieved greater success at the training station than students who were substantially dissimilar to their training sponsors. He reported that a significant relationship existed between student training and sponsor similarity as determined by work attitude comparisons and three success indicators: training station performance, attitudes on the job, and academic performance at school. Also, a significant relationship existed between student sponsor similarity as determined by personality factor comparisons and four success indicators: training station performance, attitude, promptness on the job, and academic performance in school. Because of these significant relationships, a recommendation from this study was to institute personality factor and work attitude comparisons between students and prospective training sponsors as a means of assisting job placement.

Litchford (1977) used semistructured interviews to identify Roanoke, Virginia area training sponsor perceptions toward the coordination phase of the cooperative plan program with regard to objectives, training sponsor roles, training agreements, training plans, training sponsor benefits, and training sponsor recommendations for improvement of the coordination phase of program operation. He concluded that sponsors perceived use of training agreements at the time the data were collected as being adequate for quality control, but recommended that steps be taken to insure that all parties honor the provisions of the agreement. Also, the majority of the respondents were not involved in the development of training plans but perceived them as having potential for performance improvement. They also recommended that teacher coordinators schedule appointments and make more frequent coordination visits. Litchford noted that most of the recommendations made by the training sponsors could be acted on by teacher coordinators and would not require additional financial resources.

Also, using the case study form of descriptive research, Hutt (1975) assessed the perceptions of participating employers toward the distributive education program by conducting semistructured group interviews in five Michigan communities. He concluded that: employers described the objectives of the distributive education program broadly; displayed an overall satisfaction with the distributive education cooperative program; believed that there was little difference between the roles of the cooperating supervisor and the supervisor of all other employees; demonstrated an awareness of only a few components of the program; obtained both intangible and tangible benefits from participating in the program; and preferred basic classroom topics such as basic mathematics and communication skills to the specific content topics of marketing and distribution.

At the postsecondary level, Kozma (1978) surveyed distributive education middle management students in Florida community and junior colleges to determine the nature and characteristics of training stations, focusing on how the on-the-job training activities were viewed by the students and their worth in helping students' career goals. He concluded that the students surveyed found the occupational experience component of their mid-management program effective in meeting their career objectives.

Training Plans

A document used in the distributive education program is the training plan. In the research conducted by Crawford (1975), a basic belief held by supervisors and teacher educators was that each student should have an individualized training plan specifying competencies to be learned on-the-job and/or in the classroom laboratory. Furthermore, they believed that this plan should be cooperatively constructed by the teacher coordinator, the training sponsor, and the student.

Holup (1980) found positive attitudes of teachers, state supervisors, and teacher educators toward training plans by surveying a national sample of distributive educators using a semantic differential. Two studies were found that specifically investigated the use of training plans in high school cooperative plan programs. Lynch and White (1971) sought to provide an overview of the national state of the art concerning the importance and utilization of training plans and solicited samples of training plans. They found that 81 percent of the state supervisors nationwide responding to their informal survey claimed that training plans were essential for the effective operation of a distributive education program and that no respondents indicated that they were not necessary. One-third of the respondents reported that they required their teacher coordinators to develop training plans for each student and two-thirds claimed that they encouraged their coordinators to use training plans but did not require them to do so. Overall, the state supervisors indicated that about half of the high school teacher coordinators utilized training plans and 85 percent of the state supervisors reported that their coordinators had been provided inservice training in usage of training plans. Using semistructured interviews, Litchford (1977) found that the majority of training sponsors in Roanoke, Virginia were not involved in the development of training plans but perceived them as having potential for performance improvement by students.

Casterline (1974) sought to determine whether inservice training for teacher coordinators in the development and use of training plans affects how cooperative training sponsors, distributive education students, and teacher coordinators perceived distributive education as a training program. The inservice sessions provided during the course of this study were found to have a positive effect on the perceptions of three populations about distributive education as a training program. Those students, teacher coordinators, and training sponsors who used training plans had more positive perceptions of distributive education as a training program than those who did not use training plans.

Classroom Techniques

Two studies were reviewed that involved the use of various methods and techniques. Teaching beliefs and classroom methodology of selected distributive education teacher coordinators were investigated by Doneth (1969) who found that cooperative and project plan teacher coordinators expressed the same beliefs toward the instructional phase of the program. He also found that belief statements did not distinguish between teacher coordinators identified as outstanding or least effective by teacher educators and state supervisors. Doneth identified and described 157 teaching strategies.

Berns (1978) developed a semantic differential instrument to determine the attitudes of Ohio teacher coordinators and students toward eighteen classroom techniques. He found generally favorable attitudes toward each technique by both groups. However, the degree of positivism differed between the teacher coordinators and students. Teacher coordinator and student attitudes toward the following techniques were the highest rated: guest speaker, field trip, demonstration, audiovisual presentation, simulation game, case study, brainstorming, and field interview. These attitude findings are not consistent with Roberson's (1979) "frequency of use" findings. He surveyed 317 high school cooperative distributive education teacher coordinators from thirty states and ranked twenty teaching methods according to their frequency of use as indicated by the respondents. In his study, the most highly ranked methods were lecture/discussion, group discussions, lecture, question and answer, demonstrations, projects, simulated business activities, and buzz sessions. Although the Berns (1978) and Roberson (1979) studies surveyed different populations and different, although similar, techniques, it is of interest that those methods with the higher ranked attitude ratings (out of eighteen) according to Berns were not consistently ranked higher (out of twenty) according to Roberson.

The following methods were used in both studies and ranked in the top eight out of eighteen in the Berns attitude study. The number in parentheses is the rank out of twenty according to frequency of use as found in the Roberson study: guest speaker (fifteen), field trip (eighteen), demonstration (five), game (sixteen), case study (ten), and brainstorming (eleven). Perhaps of greatest significance is that lecture/discussion was ranked first in frequency of use (Roberson) but ranked ninth by teacher coordinators in relation to their attitude toward that particular technique and ranked fourteenth by students (Berns).

Audiovisual techniques

Three studies were located which concerned the use of audiovisual materials in distributive education training, one of the preferred techniques of teachers and students, according to Berns (1978). Using role playing and critique methodology, Stroh (1968) investigated effects on learning caused by self-confrontation via videotape replay compared with audiotape replay. Experienced industrial salespersons were taught listening skills, the use of open-ended and reflective questions, and related techniques. Each salesperson role consisted of three sales interviews in private with the investigator. No significant differences were found between methods, but videotape was found to be superior in reducing interruptions and increasing the sharing of the conversation. Audiotape was found to be superior for active listening, nonverbal perception, use of questions, and use of supportive statements. Videotape subjects decreased in effectiveness after the first performance and self-confrontation, but gained after the second; the audiotape subjects improved steadily with each performance and more or less evenly on all criteria.

Smith (1970) measured the effectiveness of selected components of an instructional system for teaching interpersonal relations for retail sales to distributive education students. A group of high school distributive education students was divided into four subgroups, each of which was assigned a different method of instruction - programmed instruction, audiscan instruction (a self-contained instructional device which incorporated the use of film cartridges with an accompanying audiopresentation and featured a soundslide presentation programmed for automatic stops and restarts so that students could respond either overtly or covertly to material in the cartridge), combined instruction (using both programmed and audiscan materials), and no instruction (a control group). He found that students using the audiscan strategy achieved significantly better than students using the other three strategies, and students using the combined strategy achieved significantly better than students who used the programmed instruction strategy.

Garblik (1972) developed a transparency program for teaching introductory textiles. Using a panel of educators, he found that the use of this program at the secondary and postsecondary levels was suitable.

Games

One study was found that pertained to games. Golabek (1973) compared a consumer game to the conventional method of instruction in distributive education classes at the high school level with regard to learning achievement. He found no difference between the posttest scores of students receiving the treatment and those in the control group. However, when teacher training was used as a variable, there was a significant difference on posttest achievement scores of students in the control group whose teachers did not participate in a training workshop when compared with students in the experimental group whose teacher also did not participate in the workshop. He also found that students indicated they like the game and found it to be interesting. Furthermore, a large percentage of the students indicated the game taught them the value of teamwork, helped them to make decisions under pressure, and taught them to make independent decisions.

Competency-Based Instruction

A major movement toward competency-based instruction began with the Crawford (1967) study which identified the competencies needed for successful performance in sixty-seven marketing occupations within seven employment areas. In her work, 983 competencies wereidentified and served as the basis for a major, on-going effort by a group of states to develop, field test, and disseminate Learning Activity Packages (LAPs) based upon these competencies. After dissemination of the original LAPs, the consortium of states known as the Interstate Distributive Education Curriculum Consortiumbecame a public corporation and moved to The Ohio State University.

As compared to other topics related to distributive education, investigations of various aspects of IDECC were numerous. Of major concern in many of these studies were the attitudes, perceptions, and practices of teacher coordinators and students regarding the implementation and use of the IDECC LAPs. Perhaps of more significance were studies which attempted to compare the IDECC system of instruction with more conventional methodology.

Of the studies located, the first research related to IDECC LAPs conducted since the Crawford (1967) study was the field testing of the original LAP. Weber (1972) developed a field test model which included procedures and instruments and served as the guide for the evaluation of the LAPs by representatives of the eleven original state members of IDECC. The field test judged characteristics relating to students, materials, administration, economics, and personnel. Weber et al. (1974) reported the results of this field test as highly favorable to the LAPs method of instruction when the findings were compared to criteria established by the consortium of states. As a result of the field test, revisions were made in the LAPs prior to dissemination. Most subsequent research was based upon the revised LAPs which were disseminated to distributive education programs in 1973.

In another evaluative study, Boulware (1976) analyzed the mathematics LAPs and assessed the reliability and content and construct validity of the LAPs posttests. He found that the posttests were on the whole reliable and valid. He also investigated whether or not the mathematics LAPs were sequenced by difficulty and found that although no definite sequence appeared to be present, a sequence by difficulty existed for twenty-three LAPs using a computational method and seventeen LAPs using a substantive method.

Several studies attempted to determine the amount of usage of the IDECC system of instruction. Weber et al. (1976) found that 43 percent of the North Carolina teachers surveyed used LAPs, Maglio (1978) reported that 87 percent of the teacher coordinators in Wisconsin used them; Roberson (1979) indicated that 54 percent of the 265 teacher coordinators in thirty states responding to his survey were actively using the LAPs; Allen (1976) found that the average amount of classroom time spent on LAPs as reported by teacher coordinators in West Virginia was 30-40 percent. Furthermore, the average number of competencies completed by each student using LAPs was 41 to 50 percent. Other studies which investigated usage of LAPs included the Anderton (1976) and Parker (1979) studies.

The manner by which teacher coordinators were using LAPs appeared to vary from using them as the basis for the entire program curriculum to using them as resources and incorporating them within individual curricula. Weber et al. (1976), Anderton (1976), Blackwell (1978), Maglio (1978), Parker (1979), and Roberson (1979) specifically reported ways in which LAPs were used.

Reactions and attitudes of various distributive education populations toward LAPs were investigated in a number of studies.

Holup (1980) found a slightly positive attitude toward IDECC by teachers, state supervisors, and teacher educators in a national study, yet, in the same study, he found the attitudes toward competency-based instruction more positive than those toward IDECC. In addition to Holup's work, Park (1975), Allen (1976), Anderton (1976), Blackwell (1978), and Parker (1979) surveyed teacher coordinators and found generally positive attitudes toward LAPs. Student attitudes toward LAPs were measured by Park (1975) who found favorable attitudes and Allen (1976) who found attitudes which seemed to vary.

Some studies centered upon specific barriers and problems associated with the use of the IDECC LAPs. Ditzenberger (1976) measured the attitudes of teacher coordinators from ten states toward IDECC LAPs and found that fifty-four perceived barriers to implementing the system. His findings along with the findings of the Anderton (1976), Allen (1976), and Park (1975) studies indicated that the management of the LAPs, including such clerical activities as duplicating materials, was a problem area. From the student perspective, the factor of the management of the LAPs drew varied responses. Park (1975) found students to be impressed with the efficient management of LAPs, but Allen (1976) concluded that students seem to support the idea that management was a barrier to the use of the system. Students indicated that they would like to move faster through the LAPs but that paper work slowed down that process. Other major problems identified by Allen included the level of student motivation, need for resource materials, and the lack of student career objectives.

The use of LAPs in relation to teacher coordinator change orientation as measured by the Russell Change Orientation Scale was investigated by Anderton (1976), Ditzenberger (1976), and Weber et al. (1976). Two of these studies drew similar conclusions. Anderton (1976) found a moderately positive relationship between the change orientation of the Ohio teacher coordinators participating in her study and their initial attitude toward LAPs. Generally, coordinators who had more positive change orientations tended to have more positive attitudes. This finding is consistent with the conclusion reported in the study by Ditzenberger (1976) that the high change orientation teachers from the ten states in his study were less concerned than low change orientation teachers about each of the six perceived barrier categories found through his work. Weber et al. (1976) found no significant difference in change orientation between the group of distributive education teachers who used LAPs and the group of teachers who did not use LAPs.

From the studies dealing with perceived barriers and attitudes of distributive educators toward use of the IDECC LAPs, a need became apparent that teacher coordinators should be prepared specifically for implementation of the learning system. Parker (1979) concluded that there was a need for additional training for teacher coordinators in order to improve the effectiveness of LAPs. He indicated that the teacher coordinator performs as a diagnostician, tutor, and learning manager when using LAPs. As a preliminary step toward the development of teacher preparation modules, Williams (1977) surveyed teachers in five states and identified 100 relevant pedagogical tasks performed by distributive education teacher coordinators who used the IDECC system. He found that these tasks were related primarily to five functional categories of teaching and to a lesser extent to six other categories. He also identified which tasks should be emphasized at the preservice level and which at the inservice level of teacher education.

Six studies were located which compared the IDECC LAPs system of instruction to more conventional, traditional methodology. Allen (1976) found that fewer than half the teacher coordinators surveyed in West Virginia claimed they preferred the LAPs method of instruction to the one they customarily used. This finding seemed to be in contradiction with the findings by Park (1975) that the Wisconsin and Indiana teacher coordinators' attitudes were highly favorable toward LAPs superseding traditional teaching methods. Ramey (1976) used distributive education students in two comparable suburban secondary schools, one of which had a program and teacher with a record of successful implementation of the IDECC system and the other of which had a record of success in using conventional group instructional methods. A sample of twenty students from the eleventh grade distributive education enrollment was drawn in each school. A pretest determined no significant difference between the two groups in relation to previous skills and knowledge. Four categories of competencies tested in the study were skills and knowledge in mathematics and skills and knowledge in human relations. A t-test determined that a significant difference existed on the posttest scores means in favor of the IDECC system in each of the four categories.

Cunningham (1976) also studied the human relations component of the LAPs at the high school level. A random sample of participating schools in East Tennessee was studied which included 229 distributive education students in five schools. This study used a randomized control group pretest-posttest design and evaluated both the main effect and the interaction effect of the variables involved. The dependent variable was achievement measured by the posttests. Hypotheses were tested by using maximum regression analysis, a multiple classification analysis of variance, and a t-test of the grand mean difference. Each teacher taught the content through the conventional method and the individualized LAP method. The main conclusion of the study was that there was no significant difference between the two methodologies. Career maturity, sex, mental ability, and reading comprehension were important contributors to a student's achievement within human relations in distributive education, but socioeconomic background, work experience, and exposure to a feeder program made no difference.

Although most studies investigated the use of the IDECC system in secondary schools, one study was found which compared the IDECC approach to traditional methodology at the postsecondary level and one at the adult level. Williams and Heath-Sipos (1978) used sixteen postsecondary classes to determine if teaching approach after controlling for school effect and selected student variables contributed significantly to student achievement in a unit which contained fourteen competencies. The experimental treatment was the IDECC systematic approach and the control group received traditional instruction. The study investigated forty variables and was able to account for approximately 50 percent of the variance among the posttest scores. Using analysis of covariance by regression, instructional methodology was not found to significantly contribute to the variance. However, when the sources of variance were restricted to thirteen with only an approximately 6 percent loss of the variance accounted for, teaching approach in combination with related occupational experience did make a significant contribution. Using this restricted analysis model, the investigators found that students with less than two and one-half years of related occupational experience achieved higher when learning by the traditional teaching approach and that students with over two and one-half years of experience had higher achievement when learning by the IDECC approach.

At the adult level, Williams and Berns (1978) used a similar research design to compare the IDECC approach to traditional teaching. Forty-eight variables were studied which were found to contribute almost 82 percent of the variance among the posttest scores. Using this model, teaching approach was found to significantly contribute to the posttest scores when considered in combination with student past participation in distributive education programs. Students without past participation in distributive education tended to achieve a higher posttest score when taught using the IDECC approach than students taught using the traditional approach. Conversely, students with past participation in distributive education tended to achieve a higher posttest score when taught using the traditional approach. When the investigators restricted the sources of variance to nineteen, only a loss of approximately 4 percent of the variance accounted for occurred and again teaching approach was found to significantly contribute to the posttest scores but only when considered in combination with number of years of supervisory/managerial experience. Students with fewer than 2.89 years of supervisory/managerial experience taught by the IDECC approach tended to achieve higher posttest scores than students taught by the traditional approach. However, as the number of years of supervisory and/or managerial experience increased past 2.89 years, students taught by the traditional approach achieved higher posttest scores than the students taught by the IDECC approach. An implication raised by the investigators was that since supervisory/managerial experience was directly related to the content of the unit taught in this study (namely, employee training, evaluation and motivation), students with little or no experience in the content to be studied may gain more knowledge by using the IDECC approach rather than the traditional approach.

Two other studies were located which related to competency-based instruction, although not directly related to IDECC. Stapleton (1977) determined that is was possible to develop a computer-assisted information delivery system that would enable distributive educators to maintain and administer individual student records pertaining to a selected marketing occupation and the proficiency levels for the competencies required in that occupation.

A concept that is often used in conjunction with competency-based instruction is individualized instruction. The Wisconsin State Board of Vocational Education (1971) conducted a study to determine the present and future use of individualized instruction in postsecondary business and marketing offerings. The data were collected by use of interviews with representatives of each of the eighteen Wisconsin districts. Analysis of the data revealed that individualized instruction was widely used, particularly in business education courses. Students and teachers were found to be positive in their attitudes toward individualized instruction.

STUDENT ORGANIZATION

An increase in the number of research studies investigating problems related to the student organization in distributive education is evident since the publication of the previous two editions of this review and synthesis. Crawford (1967) found agreement among distributive education supervisors and teacher educators for the belief, "That DECA, ... should be cocurricular in that it should provide opportunities to further develop competencies normally learned in the classroom and on the job ..." This belief was confirmed by Virginia supervisors, teacher educators, and teacher coordinators in a study by Berns and Smith (1979).

Dailey (1977) surveyed New York state high school DECA members, advisors, guidance directors, and principals regarding the functions and operations of DECA. A profile of characteristics of the DECA organization in New York state was developed. Furthermore, he sought to identify differences in the perceptions of these groups toward sixty-three belief statements. He concluded that the four groups had differences between them as they viewed beliefs associated with DECA. The advisors, guidance directors, and principals, however, were agreeable within the groups to all of the beliefs, but the student members were basically unsure as to where they stood in regard to the beliefs. This research project was reported in the CDTE Professional Bulletin number 30 which contains a host of findings and conclusions regarding the perceptions and characteristics of the respondents.

One of the conclusions reached by Dailey was that beliefs regarding the role of the advisor and his/her respective responsibilities were viewed with less agreement between the respondent groups (identified above) than the remaining beliefs. Crawford (1967) cited four critical tasks performed by teacher coordinators in relation to DECA. By surveying state supervisors, local supervisors, teacher educators and teacher coordinators in Virginia, Berns and Smith (1979) identified ninety-seven tasks performed by Virginia DECA chapter advisors. They also determined levels to which the competencies needed to perform the tasks should be learned using the procedures identified by Ammerman and Essex (1977), Ammerman and Pratzner (1977), and Mead, Essex, and Ammerman (1977). They found that each task should be learned in the preservice teacher education program and twenty-two of the tasks should be addressed through inservice instruction. McComas (1978) found that workshops for DECA advisors aid in improving the DECA organization for members. McLean (1973) identified the characteristics of DECA and its advisors and investigated the attitudes of Minnesota advisors toward DECA. He concluded that teacher education institutions need to take more active roles in preparing coordinators as advisors.

In a national survey using the Delphi technique, Corbin (1975) identified twelve goals and seventy-two objectives for the high school division of DECA. He indicated that these were goals toward which several years of study in distributive education and concurrent participation in DECA might be aimed. The objectives served as the actions, knowledge, and skills the DECA member must learn to attain the goals. Basing his study on two of Corbin's goals, Clark (1978) investigated the benefits to high school distributive education students of active participation in DECA and compared the growth of these students with students who had little or no active part in DECA. He found that students in the "high activity" group scored higher on the Minnesota Counseling Inventory leadership scale than students in the "middle and low activity" groups.

Bailey (1979) also studied leadership development in relation to DECA. He conducted a leadership development workshop for student officers and tested the effect using a leadership opinion questionnaire and semantic differential in a two-by-two factorial design. He concluded that the workshop had an effect on the attitudes of the participants toward initiating structure, group activities, decision making, and self-confidence, but the nature of this effect was dependent upon the sex of the participant.

Glendale Union High School District 205 (1975) in Arizona also evaluated a leadership training conference for students in relation to participant satisfaction and a postconference evaluation was made to determine the effectiveness of the conference. Riley (1974) evaluated an institute for DECA student officers and advisors in Kentucky by conducting an ongoing, daily evaluation and a formal evaluation during the institute's last session. He found that participants enjoyed the format of the institute, rated the consultants high, recommended that additional institutes be conducted, and gained knowledges and skills concerning the use of DECA as a teaching tool. A follow-up study to this institute showed an increase of more than 500 percent in local DECA participation. Furthermore, following the institute, the regional conferences were found to be more uniform than previously and the involvement of local and regional officers and local members increased.

Only one study was found that related to the junior collegiate division of DECA. Callahan (1979) used a Delphi technique to identify and rank twelve goals for this division. He found that the research jury used in the study was in general agreement with a sample of junior collegiate chapter advisors for ten of the twelve goals.

Several studies were conducted which investigated the impact of DECA activities. Gleason (1979) surveyed 364 of the 1978 graduates of the high school distributive education program in Ohio and found that when students actively participated in DECA and had an expressed occupational objective, they were likely to enter the field for which they were trained. Therefore, he recommended that students be encouraged to participate in DECA. Cushman's (1973) study revealed a similar result. After collecting information from 380 students who were randomly selected from high school distributive education graduates in New York state, he found that DECA membership correlated with entry into a related job or related college curriculum.

In another follow-up study, Righthand (1977) surveyed former Connecticut distributive education students who graduated in 1965, 1968, and

1971. Only 18 percent of the respondents judged DECA to be "of little value" or "no value," while 49 percent judged it to be "somewhat valuable," and 34 percent indicated that it was "very valuable." Buckner's (1978) study also found that the 1971 and 1972 high school distributive education graduates he surveyed considered DECA competition as being most useful in a career.

Another approach was used by Clark (1978) to determine the impact of DECA on students. In this instance, the comparison was made between active and inactive members of the organization. The study compared students in randomly selected Minnesota distributive education programs as to their actual participation in DECA activities which were related to the development of leadership skills and self-confidence or self-acceptance. Pre- and posttests were administered to measure leadership outcomes and self-acceptance outcomes for each of the students. In order to make comparisons, the students were classified into three groups, high, middle, or low in activity in DECA. The pre- and posttests were standardized instruments for measuring self-concept and leadership. A major finding of this study was a significant difference in scores on the leadership instrument. The high activity students apparently developed higher levels of leadership ability than those who were less active in DECA. There was apparently little or no impact of DECA participation on the student's self-confidence or self-acceptance. Holt (1978) surveyed DECA high school members, advisors, and training station employers in Louisiana. Students, teacher coordinators, and training station employers were supportive of DECA as an important part of the instructional program. Holt formulated the following conclusions: distributive education classroom instruction combined with the DECA program of activities gave increased scope and depth to the total distributive education program; DECA activities allowed students an opportunity to understand and to implement their obligations of citizenship; DECA activities brought various instructional parts of the distributive education program into focus; and the primary benefits of DECA to students were learning experiences and personal growth.

Sternberg (1976) studied selected values and attitudes of New Jersey high school distributive education students and found that students who were members of DECA responded more positively by a greater percentage to almost all sixty-seven items on an instrument that reflected values and attitudes than students who were not DECA members.

Connell (1977) conducted an investigation to determine the relationship of membership in DECA and career maturity. Obviously career development is only one of the many possible benefits of DECA participation. This study was conducted in New Jersey, where

DECA membership is not mandatory. The subjects (207 DECA members and 101 non-DECA distributive education students) were not randomly selected and cannot be considered representative of the New Jersey distributive education student population that was studied. With these limitations in view, the following findings of the study do suggest that DECA participation had a positive impact on career maturity. The DECA members were found to be more mature in terms of knowing themselves relative to career selection than the non-DECA group. They also know more about the world of work, did better at choosing jobs consistent with their interests and abilities, and knew more about career decision-making procedures.

In a cost-benefit analysis in Missouri, Strate (1974) studied student income during first and fourth year following graduation; no important relationship was found between membership and participation in DECA and the level of the student's income after graduation.

In another New Jersey study, Rossi (1974) surveyed high school principals and teacher coordinators to determine their opinions regarding various components of the distributive education program. DECA was recognized as being instrumental in strengthening the vocational experience. However, the need was expressed to review the activities of DECA so that they could be redesigned to better meet the needs of the students. At about that time, the national DECA organization began to review its activities, especially in the area of competitive events. The relevance of the events offered by DECA was studied and a new approach to competition was initiated. Events were begun which were competency-based so that student members could compete in an occupational category in marketing in which they were interested. Thus, competitive events such as apparel and accessories, food marketing, food service, etc. were begun at two levels: manager/owner and master employee. Furthermore, students were evaluated in a series of instructional areas which consisted of competencies needed by workers in the particular occupational category. A number of studies involved evaluating the competency-based competitive events program initiated within DECA during the 1970s. The first of these studies was conducted by Eggland and Lynch (1974). They investigated procedural, logistic, and administrative concerns of the first national level pilot of the newly conceived competitive events at the 1974 Career Development Conference by surveying competitive event participants. This study was followed by an evaluation of the 1975 national competency-based competitive events that was conducted by Edutek (1975) in which answers to two basic questions were explored: were the competitive events learning experiences for the students participating in the events and were they reflective of the skills required of people working in the jobs simulated by the events? Competitive event participants, their advisors, and judges were surveyed. With few qualifications, the answers to both questions investigated were found to be yes. In-house evaluations by National DECA were conducted in 1976, 1977, and 1978 in order to collect further information for improvement of the events.

Another phase of competency-based competitive events introduced in the 1970s involved written events. Upon inception of a written event, it was to be evaluated for two years to gather information to be used for eventual adoption of the event by National DECA. At the time of this writing, the following written events had been evaluated at least once by Ditzenberger (1977, 1978, 1979): apparel and accessories, food marketing, general merchandising, and finance and credit. In these studies, participating members, advisors, and judges at the Career Development Conference were surveyed to determine their attitudes toward the value of the events and to identify suggestions for improvement of the process of conducting the events.

Smith (1979) investigated methods and curriculum materials used to prepare students for competition in the 1979 Texas Career Development Conference and determined whether selected factors contributed to successful competition in the competency-based competitive events.

The pilot Merit Awards Program (MAP) of DECA was evaluated by Patton (1971) who found no difference in economic understanding and sales competencies between students participating in MAP and students not participating. Teacher coordinators generally agreed that MAP achieved its general purpose, achieved the objectives of teaching economic understandings and marketing competencies, and was overall a success. Students believed that MAP provided interesting activities and should be implemented within distributive education on a national basis.

The regional development of DECA in the Southern and North Atlantic regions was studied by McComas (1978). She found that regional development would aid in increasing membership and participation, and the use of leadership development institutes would aid in improving the DECA organization for members.

Facilities, Equipment, and Resources

There continued to be little research on distributive education facilities, equipment, and resources. This seems to be rather surprising in light of the apparent trend toward project method programs using in-school laboratories and increased utilization of new systems of instruction with emphasis on individualized and small group instruction. Lancaster (1972) developed and evaluated a model which could be used in determining user requirements when planning facilities for laboratory experiences in junior college distributive education programs. He concluded that the primary aim in stating user requirements was to provide the most complete and understandable set of educational specifications. The model developed in this study was judged as acceptable although the investigator cautioned that there may be other methods of developing user requirements which were as productive.

In his curriculum, methods, and materials study, Roberson (1979) ranked 110 distributive education publications in relation to their usage as reported by the teacher coordinators within four categories: individual instruction, small group instruction, large group instruction, and composite. The publications ranked in the top four in the composite category were Retailing Principles and Practice by Richert, Meyer, Haines, and Harris: Retail Merchandising by Wingate and Samson; Marketing and Distribution by Mason, Rath and Ross; and Fundamentals of Selling by Wingate and Nolan. Another finding of this study was that the mean of the 241 yearly instructional materials budgets reported was $657.

A statewide evaluation of facilities, equipment, and instructional resources in distributive education was conducted by Banister (1969) in Arkansas. The study involved the development of an instrument for evaluation purposes. A literature review was the source of information. A panel of educators in distributive education was used to validate a survey instrument which was then used to evaluate twelve distributive education programs. A general conclusion of this investigation was that distributive education programs in Arkansas were providing adequate facilities, equipment, and instructional resources. In addition to evaluating the programs under study, Banister used the information he obtained as the basis for a series of recommendations about how programs might be improved through better facilities, equipment, utilization of instructional resources, and planning.

A "model store-learning laboratory" was designed by Strate and Brorson (1976) through a literature review, interviews with business personnel, and a survey of teacher coordinators. Instructional materials and equipment needed for such a lab were identified and evaluative criteria for measuring the effectiveness of the laboratory were developed.

Measurement of Learner Achievement

Methods of assessing student performance were evaluated in two studies. Smith (1969) developed sixteen achievement tests designed for use in North Carolina distributive education courses and checked their reliability and validity. He also determined the easiness percentage ranges and discrimination indices. As cited previously, Boulware (1976) evaluated IDECC's mathematics LAPS posttests and found them, in the whole, reliable and valid.

Snyder (1978) studied the value of including employability skills modules in the distributive education curriculum. Six specific skills were taught to students in the experimental group and another group of students was used as a control group. In all, 382 distributive education students from ten schools in Michigan were involved in the study. A posttest was developed and pilot tested by the researcher. She found that the materials made a difference in student achievement on the measures of how to write cover letters, how to behave during an interview, and how to write a resume. However, no significant differences were found between students in the experimental and control groups on the measures of how to identify personal assets, how to complete an application blank or how to respond to an interviewer's questions. Also, females scored higher than males on every item on the posttest.

Summary

Although the number of studies dealing with various facets of instruction certainly increased in recent years, one needs to analyze the types of research being conducted and the knowledge being discovered which could be used for the improvement of the marketing and distributive education programs. Studies dealing with perceptions, attitudes, and descriptive data, although helpful, may not contribute as much information as investigations which determine the effectiveness of specified instructional strategies or material and provide cost-benefit information. Some quasi-experimental studies were completed during the time period but these were a small percentage of total studies. Attention now seems to be warranted in those types of studies which would provide information to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of the program.

Two topics which seemed to draw the most research in the area of instruction were the competency-based IDECC LAPs and the student organization, DECA. Other studies related to instruction seemed to be a scattering of endeavors which attempted to find information somewhat in isolation. These studies did not appear to build upon each other.

Evidence provided by recent research seemed to support certain assumptions upon which distributive educators have operated for many years. The cooperative method of instruction continued to appear as an effective avenue for learning and components of it were deemed important including the use of training plans, the need for identifying student occupational interests, relating their on-the-job training and classroom instruction to those interests, and the need to carefully place students with training sponsors. Furthermore, one study provided evidence that alternate week work schedules for cooperative students may need to be considered along with the more typical daily part-time schedules. Attitudes of participants in marketing and distributive education seemed to be positive toward most concerns including teaching techniques, training plans, competency-based instruction and LAPs.

IDECC was a major area of interest with numerous studies focusing directly on various aspects of the system. Studies were conducted which attempted to compare the attitudes toward and effectiveness of the IDECC LAPs and conventional teaching but did not seem to provide clear evidence for either supporting or rejecting the use of the system. Perhaps the clearest notion coming out of these studies was that the IDECC system seemed to be more effective under certain conditions whereas traditional teaching appeared to be more effective under other sets of conditions.

DECA also received considerable attention and the evidence provided through the studies related to this youth organization supported its use. DECA remained to be considered a vital, integral part of marketing and distributive education. The need for preparing and providing inservice training for teacher coordinators in competencies related to DECA was apparent. Goals and objectives for two DECA divisions were identified and were found to directly apply to the marketing and distributive education curriculum. Competency-based competitive events more closely aligned the activities of DECA to the curriculum and were evaluated in order to find methods for improvement. Most evaluative data regarding these competitive events were favorable in that the purposes of competitive events were being met by the events.

GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING

Obviously, the field of guidance and counseling has a body of knowledge from which marketing and distributive educators should draw for application to the program and its students. However, specific studies related to the guidance and counseling of marketing and distributive education students were found to be very few.

In Crawford's (1975) national study, supervisors and teacher educators of distributive education were found to have the following basic beliefs regarding guidance: each distributive education student should have a distributive occupational interest if he is to give his best effort in developing the required competencies and in making occupational choices and adjustments; all applicants for the distributive education program should be carefully considered to assure the inclusion of those students who can and sincerely wish to profit from instruction; and distributive education students should be counseled periodically by teacher coordinators, employers, and guidance counselors concerning progress toward their career objectives.

Husted (1977) investigated distributive education guidance activities. A random selection of 342 members of NADET was made from the 2144 total membership in 1976. The selected distributive education teacher coordinators were asked to respond to a questionnaire reflecting the fourteen basic beliefs regarding guidance in distributive education which were identified by Crawford (1975). These practices had been previously categorized into seven guidance functions using a Delphi technique with a group of twenty-five distributive education teacher educators. The questionnaire required the teachers to respond to each item indicating how important they felt the item was, how much importance was being given to that particular guidance function at the time, and how much importance should be given to the function in an ideal situation. Findings included a rank order of their importance as presented below (from highest to lowest): placement, recruitment and selection, educational guidance, career counseling and occupational information, personal/social counseling, follow-up, and permanent record and inventory. Comparisons were made between individuals who had previously majored in distributive education and those who had not. Also, teachers who had been exposed to vocational guidance through university course work were compared with those who had no university training in that area. Appraently, having majored in distributive education made no difference, but very substantial differences were found between distributive education teachers who had taken courses in guidance as part of their undergraduate training and those who had not taken such courses. These individuals with guidance training were found to place more importance on the permanent record and inventory function than those with no guidance training. They also were more likely to speak at PTA and other parents' meetings, maintain an active file of all distributive education applications, work with counselors in arranging students' schedule, conduct follow-up studies of graduates and dropouts, assist those students with work adjustment, and cooperate with counselors as a team in providing guidance for students. Therefore, the findings of this investigation clearly indicated the need to infuse into the undergraduate teacher education programs training in guidance and counseling for prospective distributive education teachers.

One aspect of the distributive education recruitment program was investigated by Braverman (1972). The purpose of this study was to determine whether a recruitment program designed for tenth grade students and a system of mailing information to parents of these students would affect the enrollment in distributive education in a New Jersey high school. In addition to studying the impact of these two recruiting devices on enrollment, their impact on attitudes of the students and their parents was also investigated. An experimental design was used where 400 students and their parents were randomly selected, then stratified into four groups: male, female, college intended, and non-college intended. A configuration of four groups was used so that experimental and control groups were available for each of the two variables under study. A questionnaire was administered to all of the subjects of the study. Several tests were used to measure the attitudes of students and parents as a pretest. Then posttest information was collected at the conclusion of the study. The recruiting program did have an impact on enrollment. The students who had been exposed to the recruiting program had more favorable attitudes and also were more likely to enroll in the program. Another outcome of the study was the determination that the attitudes of the students were not altered by the attitudes of their parents and vice versa. Also, sex was not a significant factor in the results of the study. It was further concluded that students who received neither the publicity mailing nor the formal recruiting program were found to avoid participation in distributive education just as students in previous years had done.

Barger (1976) developed and determined the effectiveness of a career development unit for the first level of the distributive education curriculum. Variables related to total career maturity were investigated. Twelve schools were randomly selected for inclusion in the study out of twenty schools within the East Tennessee area. The selected schools were then randomly assigned to control and experimental groups. The career development unit was presented to the experimental group, while the control group experienced regular classroom instruction. Crites' Career Maturity Inventory served as the pretest and posttest instrument. No significant difference was found between the groups on the variable of attitude. However, a significant difference was found for the variables of self-appraisal ability, occupational information, goal selection ability, planning ability, and total career maturity. The investigator therefore concluded that the unit was effective in facilitating a change in the career maturity for those students composing the experimental group.

TEACHER EDUCATION

Emphasis on research related to marketing and distributive teacher education appeared to increase during a time when the number of institutions offering marketing and distributive teacher education leveled off. Teacher education programs have expanded their curricula and increased the number of faculty. However, only one study was found which described teacher education. Crawford (1975) identifed sixteen basic beliefs concerning preservice and inservice teacher education by using a variation of Q-methodology with marketing and distributive education supervisors and teacher educators. These beliefs related to the following topics: providing specialized training for teachers of marketing and coordinators of cooperative and project plan instruction, training teachers of special needs students, student teaching, occupational knowledge, experience and competence of teachers, methodology, group and individual instruction, the teacher as a learning manager, adult education, postsecondary education, certification requirements, curriculum of teacher education programs, entrepreneurship, and middle school teaching. In this section, investigations related to the following topics will be addressed: recruitment and admission to teacher education programs, preservice teacher candidate personal characteristics, desired behaviors and characteristics of teacher-coordinators at the prevocational, secondary, postsecondary and adult levels, coordination, learner perception of teacher coordinators, occupational experiences for marketing and distributive educators, inservice teacher education studies, and evaluation of marketing and distributive teacher education.

Recruitment and Admission

The roles and responsibilities for recruiting prospective distributive education teacher candidates were investigated by Wray (1970). Using the U.S.O.E. Region V teacher coordinators, teacher educators and state supervisors as the populations, he determined the extent of agreement on recruitment and admission practices among these three groups. He concluded that generally all three populations were in agreement concerning the assumptions of roles and responsibilities, and identified specific areas of responsibility for each of the three groups. He also studied the extent of agreement of the three groups concerning the information that should be included in a recruitment program designed to stimulate interests of potential teacher coordinators. He found general agreement concerning the inclusion of ten types of information.

Wallette (1974) surveyed teacher educators and state supervisors throughout the country in order to formulate viable admission systems for teacher education programs. He concluded that distributive educators were in agreement about admission criteria of undergraduate teacher education programs. In fact, distributive teacher education programs at large and small institutions had similar admission standards.

Preservice Teacher Candidate Personality Types

One study was located which dealt with personality types of preservice teacher education candidates. In this study, Swenson (1976) attempted to determine whether personality type could be used to predict academic achievement, satisfaction, success, and group membership of distributive education teacher candidates in accordance with Holland's theory of vocational choice. He found that differentiation was a significant predictor of academic satisfaction for distributive education teacher candidates. Also, congruence was a significant predictor of academic satisfaction but in a negative direction. Other significant predictors identified were harmony of vocational choice, stability of choice of college major, location within the United States, sex with harmony of vocational choice, and sex with location within the United States.

survey of distributive education in Georgia in which the respondents were asked to rate the amount of time spent teaching to each objective and how essential the objective was to the teaching field (Foust, 1979).

Graziano (1974) validated a list of seventy-five teaching competencies which were originally identified at Wayne State University. Categorical comparisons of the rankings of the teaching competencies between trade and industrial education and distributive education teachers indicated that the level of agreement on competencies varied between the two disciplines. In an effort to suggest additional competencies, Graziano reported that the respondents made repeated reference to the importance of technical background.

Renshaw (1976) studied the technical background needed by distributive education teacher coordinators by identifying the basic marketing and marketing related knowledge needs of high school distributive education personnel. He also assessed the degree of importance and the amount (depth) of knowledge needed for each item. Three hundred ninety-four knowledge items were identified, each of which was rated by the members of three panels (above average teachers, teacher educators, and state supervisors) using a Delphi technique. Each item was rated as being of essential, highly desirable, or desirable importance, and requiring at least a minimal level of understanding.

In another study related to the technical knowledge of teachers, Hogan (1977) asked state supervisors, teacher educators, and high school teachers from fourteen Western states to identify economic understandings needed by distributive education teachers. Eggland (1976) used a Delphi procedure to analyze economic competencies to determine degree of importance and depth of knowledge needed. The categories of supply and demand, profit and income, and entrepreneurship were deemed most important by participants.

Allen and Stoneman (1979) determined how much time was required by North Carolina teacher coordinators of distributive education programs using the cooperative method to perform activities beyond the hours of the regular school day and what types of activities were included. The critical tasks from the Crawford (1967) study which were categorized into the functional areas of teaching, guidance, coordination, public relations, and operations and administration, were used as the activities studied. They concluded that teacher coordinators spent time beyond the regular school day on distributive education activities in each functional area. On the average, 54 percent of the time spent on the activities took place beyond the regular school day.

93

Hansen (1975) studied the role of the high school distributive education teacher coordinator in eight areas including purpose of the program, policies of the program, DECA activities, adult education, community relationships, school responsibilities, instructional activities, and professional responsibilities. Opinions were sought of teacher coordinators and their pincipals toward forty-four role statements. A significant difference was found between teachers and principals for twenty of the statements. The greatest differences were in areas related to DECA activities, policies of the program, and school responsibilities.

Two hundred twenty-six competencies needed by high school teacher coordinators to initiate and operate a "model store-learning laboratory" were determined through a study conducted by Strate and Brorson (1976). Williams (1977) identified relevant tasks performed by teacher coordinators who used the IDECC system. One hundred pedagogical performance tasks were found to be relevant and were to form a basis for the development of instructional modules to be used in preparing teachers in the use of the IDECC LAPs. Parker (1979) investigated the types of training provided for teacher coordinators in Tennessee in the use of LAPs and concluded that there was a need for additional training for teacher coordinators in all methods of instruction for LAPS, and that individualized instruction using LAPs created new roles for teacher coordinators in that they were more able to perform as diagnosticians, tutors, and learning managers.

In an attempt to develop a plan for improving the teaching, guidance, and curriculum development competencies of teachers of marketing and counselors (in relation to marketing), Ashmun, Meyer, and Klaurens (1969) conducted a workshop to improve a selected group of competencies. Data were gathered from the participants at the beginning and ending of the training period which consisted of an evaluation of the project objectives, changes which the teachers anticipated making in their teaching, and other factors dealing with teacher and counselor perceptions of the workshop and plans for the future. The Minnesota Importance Questionnaire was used to rank order the needs of the teachers prior to the project and after completion of the project.

In a unique study in distributive education that included an analysis of teacher characteristics, Eggland (1971) described the nature of the student-teacher interaction in distributive education classes by comparing interaction patterns within Wisconsin high school distributive education classes with established norms for other types of classes. He concluded that student-teacher interaction in distributive education classes is different in some respects from that in other classes. Also compared were interaction patterns of distributive education classes using selected characteristics of teacher coordinators. One example of these findings was that teacher coordinators thirty-five years old and older tended to talk more and their students tended to talk less than teacher coordinators less than thirty-five years old.

In an attempt to determine whether the preparation of teachers for inner city/urban schools should be different from that provided for teachers in outer city/suburban schools, Ferguson (1972) studied teaching tasks in relation to the school setting in which they were performed. After identifying successful teachers in each environment, the investigator surveyed the teachers and their principals to determine the differences between the perceptions of successful teachers from the two environments toward performance tasks of teachers. Findings revealed only slight differences between the two groups in the area of distributive education program, adult education, clerical and operational activities, and professional activities. More differences were noted in the areas of instruction and youth organizations, with the largest differences occurring in the area of student counseling and personal guidance. Based on the findings, it was concluded that separate teacher education programs for the sole purpose of preparing inner city/urban teachers were not warranted. However, within the inservice instruction of teachers, attention should be given to the unique tasks and special conditions found within the urban school settings.

Turner (1974) determined whether a predictive relationship existed between personality characteristics, sex, and years of teaching experience of teachers of disadvantaged youth, and principals' ratings of the teachers' effectiveness. The population consisted of teachers employed to teach programs designed for disadvantaged youth in Virginia distributive education. It was found that only one correlation between teachers' psychological characteristics and principals' ratings of teacher effectiveness was sufficiently high enough to warrant its use as a predictor of teacher effectivenes. Teachers rated as more effective by their principals were more active and robust.

In an effort to develop an instructional program to prepare distributive education teacher coordinators to teach the EMH student, Gildan (1977) surveyed Florida special education teachers, vocational rehabilitation counselors, and business people to validate teacher competencies needed for successful implementation of a distributive education program for educable mentally handicapped.

Postsecondary

Four studies were located which dealt with competencies and characteristics of instructors of postsecondary distributive education programs. Miller (1971) surveyed community college instructors in four western states to determine the professional education competencies of distributive education instructors. The researcher reported that through the use of factor analysis, competencies clustered under the factors of instructional management and teaching-learning process were judged to require the highest level of proficiency. In a more recent study, Irwin (1977) determined a list of competencies required of postsecondary midmanagement instructors by comparing the opinions and perceptions of selected administrators and midmanagement instructors in Texas.

Isenburg (1977) identified professional characteristics of distributive education postsecondary instructors in the southeastern section of the United States in 1977 and compared the characteristics with those of postsecondary instructors of an earlier time, 1968-69. He reported an increase in the level of education achieved by instructors surveyed at the time of the study. A larger percentage had attained degrees in areas related to vocational education and administration. However, there was a general decline in professional distributive education preparation between instructors of the two time periods. Furthermore, the instructors in 1977 had fewer memberships in professional, business, and civic organizations as compared the 1968-69 instructors.

Little (1972) investigated relationships between certain personality characteristics of postsecondary instructors and job satisfaction. Compared to a selected portion of the general adult population, those postsecondary personnel studied were described as warm, outgoing, more intelligent, assertive, happy-go-lucky, venturesome, trustful, forthright, extroverted, and less neurotic. They also displayed more leadership, creativity, experimenting, and responsiveness. Compared to the general employed population, postsecondary educators received more intrinsic and general job satisfaction from their work.

Adult

Relative to the adult level of instruction, Zachrison (1977) investigated the relationship between adult distributive education instructor behavior and instructor effectiveness as perceived by students. He concluded that adult distributive education teacher effectiveness was significantly related to teacher behavior patterns of responsiveness and versatility but not related to teacher levels of assertiveness. Another adult education study by Kobe (1977) identified competencies needed by adult instructors.

COORDINATION

The coordination phase of the teacher coordinator's job served as the focus for many studies. Crawford (1975) found agreement among supervisors and teacher educators throughout the country on the primary purpose of coordination: namely, to correlate classroom instruction with all methods of learning distributive occupational competencies, including on-the-job training, simulated experiences, and experiences provided through distributive education clubs of America. Eight other basic belief statements in the study related to coordination.

Most of the studies reviewed pertained to the coordination of programs using the cooperative method. Four studies were located which surveyed distributive education students' employers and/or training sponsors in order to determine their perceptions of coordination practices. Harris (1971) studied employer preferences and teacher coordinator practices as they related to the organization and operation of cooperative plan distributive education programs at the high school level. Along with other findings, he determined the importance of selected coordinator activities to the success of distributive education programs, the proportion of coordination time devoted to these activities, the techniques used by teacher coordinators for securing training stations which the employers found most effective in gaining their participation, and the procedures employers wanted coordinators to follow in placing students and scheduling coordination visits. From the findings and conclusions of this comprehensive study, Harris offered numerous recommendations to facilitate the growth and development of distributive education programs using the cooperative method.

Ryan (1976) examined coordination activities used by teacher coordinators in Oklahoma in order to develop a more comprehensive and standardized set of coordination practices. A panel of experts was used to identify the recommended frequency of performance of coordination activities. That frequency was then compared with an alleged performance frequency as identified by teachers and an actual frequency as identified by training sponsors. He reported that the frequency with which the activities were actually performed according to the training sponsors was significantly less than the frequency with which the activities were expected to be performed and the frequency with which the activities were allegedly performed.

Clous (1976) determined the importance Ohio distributive education training sponsors placed on the teacher-coordinator performance of selected coordination competencies in their operational association with cooperative method programs. He then studied the relationship between the importance ratings given by training sponsors and the rating of those same competencies with respondent groups in two other studies, namely, the teacher educators in the Smith (1973) study and the distributive education teacher coordinators in the Cotrell (1971) study. He concluded that the training sponsors viewed the tasks as having different degrees of importance from the other respondents, and that teacher coordinators seemed to be in close agreement on the importance of the performance of the tasks.

Hobbs (1970) identified 109 public relations, supervisory, and recording and reporting practices of New York high school coordinators, determined the extent of use of each practice based upon the number of coordinators indicating they used the practice, and determined factors restricting performance of the practices. The factor most frequently restricting performance of the practices was "no need." Neither lack of administrative support nor lack of employer interest were indicated by a majority of respondents as factors restricting use of the practices. Of the variables studied, the greatest frequency of significant relationships existed between extent of use of the practices and number of years the program was in existence.

Teacher coordinator opinions toward recommended coordination activities were sought by Brownlee (1977) in order to provide distributive education state supervisors and teacher educators in Mississippi with data to plan various aspects of preservice and inservice education. He found that the categories of coordination activities which were most often rated highest in importance were developing training agreements, selecting training stations, public relations, and student control. Those categories rated lowest were relating on-the-job instruction, developing training plans, and adult distributive education.

Visitation conferences at training stations were investigated by Riley (1970). He conducted an experiemntal project in which twelve programs were studied to determine the effects of three methods of conducting visitation conferences on student attitudes toward distributive education, student attitudes toward their training stations, student work performance ratings, parent attitudes toward distributive education, employer attitudes toward distributive education, and teacher coordinator attitudes toward training stations. Riley concluded that it was possible to change student, parent, and employer attitudes toward distributive education as well as teacher coordinator and student attitudes toward training stations. Furthermore, he reported that employer ratings were not affected by visitation conferences.

Vredenburg (1975) concluded that effective coordinators tended to use 50 percent to 75 percent of their planning periods for coordination in Colorado and Wyoming. Kinnaird (1977) ascertained practices successfully used by high school coordinators for activities, duties, and expectations accomplished during June, July, and August. He identified those activities which Arkansas teacher coordinators and principals considered most important. He also explored the attitudes of coordinators and principals regarding summer coordinating and determined the distinguishable differences among the programs in Arkansas in relation to summer coordination. Finally he identified a recommended agenda for the summer time in high school distributive education coordinators.

Harrington (1970) developed a prototype self-instructional package on coordination skills which included video recorded interview modes with discrimination training. This package was tested by using control and experimental groups of distributive education teachers. He concluded that those using the package did improve their coordination skills.

Learner Perceptions of Teacher Coordinators

Three studies were located which dealt with learner perceptions of teacher coordinators. Mayleben (1973) studied the relationship between student and student teacher perceived similarities in personality. Furthermore, performance and attitude ratings that students and student teachers gave to each other were investigated at both the high school and postsecondary levels. He concluded that in the classes of the socially secure teacher, the perceived similarities in personality of the student and student teacher affected strongly the performance and attitude rating of the student teacher.

Levere (1976) measured high school distributive education students' perceptions and attitudes toward their distributive education teacher coordinators in Utah. He found that students perceived teachers with three or more years of teaching experience as being more knowledgeable, poised, interesting, and preferred than teachers with less than three years of experience.

INQUIRIES CONCERNING OCCUPATIONAL EXPERIENCES FOR DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATORS

Few inquiries were found concerning needed marketing occupational experience by distributive educators. Searle (1977) found that according to head state supervisors and teacher educators, occupational experience was necessary for certification of secondary teacher coordinators. The respondents also claimed that they felt occupational experience was important and, furthermore, that teacher coordinators should periodically return to business to keep current in marketing occupations. This belief was also documented in the Crawford (1975) study.

Wallette (1974) found that 80 percent of the teacher education institutions surveyed provided supervised occupational experience for preservice teachers. He reported a wide variation in the opinions of distributive educators concerning the amount of occupational experience students should have before entering the program and the amount of supervised occupational experience they should have while in the program.

The Litchfield and Smith (1977) study included a survey of the head teacher educators from teacher education programs across the country in order to identify the manner in which directed occupational experience programs were being conducted in the various institutions. They concluded that occupational experience was believed to be an important factor in teacher preparation for the high school level since 86 percent of the institutions included occupational experience in their certification criteria. However, they cited that the standards varied widely from state to state.

Burrow's (1976) study attempted to specifically define the role of occupational experience in effective teacher preparation. Using a national panel of teacher educators and state supervisors, and a sample of high school and postsecondary distributive education teachers from five centrally located states, he identified sixteen purposes of occupational experience and thirty-nine teaching competencies needed by teachers and which can be developed through occupational experience. The data from this study indicated that the components of a teacher's role which were most affected by occupational experience were coordination and professional role and development.

In an attempt to examine the relationship between types of occupational experience and professional competencies of preservice vocational education teachers, Eggland (1978) developed a professional competence examination with two forms to use for measuring the effectiveness of varying types and amounts of occupational experiences in developing professional competencies. A modularized directed occupational experience program was developed based on twenty competencies originally identified by Burrow (1976). Four universities with preservice programs consisting of business or distributive education undergraduate students served as testing sites. Subgroups of participants were formed on the basis of their enrollment or nonenrollment in a special supervised occupational experience course in which the completion of the twenty modules was required and on the basis of completion of required occupational experience prior to or in conjunction with their undergraduate program. Individuals in Reference Group A had completed the occupational experience requirement prior to the start of their undergraduate programs and were not enrolled in the directed occupational experience program. Reference Group B consisted of individuals who were also not enrolled in the special seminar. In contrast to Group A, however, Group B students had completed the required occupational experience during their undergraduate careers. The Laboratory Group participated in the special seminar program. A pretest was administered to the laboratory group members and a posttest was given to the participants in all groups. (The major analyses involved three-group comparisons among the laboratory group and the two reference groups. Posttest data only were used in this analysis.) Each test required student responses to six generic problems. Responses were scored for more than one property and several properties were measurable on more than one problem. These first order properties represented two general classes of performance: quantity or volume (v) of the student response (i.e., a judgment of logical aspects of student performance). These general (second order) variables were derived by simple computational formulas. A third order derived measure, strength (S) consisted of the square root of the product of V and Q, and S, which developed to discriminate between individuals performing at the same level on either the V or Q variables.

Specific instructional effects were tested for the Laboratory Group by assessing change prior to and subsequent to completion of the modules. A significant gain ($p < .05$) for the V variable was found, a significant loss on the Q variable was found and no difference on the S variable was found.

The major analyses involved three-group comparisons among the laboratory group and the two reference groups using posttest data. Differences were tested among the three groups by use of a one-way fixed effects analysis of variance, repeated across the three variables: V, Q, and S. For Test 1, a significant difference was found favoring the reference groups on the Q measure; differences on the V and S measures were not significant. On Test 2, all comparisons were significant. Reference Group B performed better than both Reference Group A and the

Laboratory Group on all measures. Demographic data for both Test 1 and Test 2 participants showed the reference groups to be significantly older, to have higher class standing, more educational training and professional education, and to have higher grade point averages than the Laboratory Group. Furthermore, Reference Group B was higher than Reference Group A on these factors. The researcher observed that for the Laboratory Group, the data showed a net performance gain. The final performance of this group was not appreciably different from Reference Group A which had participants with a much larger amount of occupational experience. Reference Group B was generally superior to the other two groups on a variety of measures. Eggland pointed out that the results indicate that certain professional competencies traditionally developed through occupational experience may be developed by other means. Specifically, a directed occupational experience appeared to be an alternative that does indeed develop professional competence. Two additional implications written by Eggland were that this study demonstrated the possibility for the alternative development of professional competencies, and that gains made by the laboratory group showed that the modules were a viable instructional strategy to serve as a catalyst to an alternative competency development strategy.

In a study which reported perhaps surprising results, Olsen (1971) randomly surveyed twenty-five coordinators and 125 training sponsors to determine whether differences existed between teachers with various occupational backgrounds in relation to student competencies, number of students remaining in distributive occupations, and program success in preparing individuals for employment in retailing. Although the research reported that significant findings were questionable because of the small number of cases involved, he concluded that the study tended to indicate that coordinators should have nonsupervisory occupational experience, no distributive experience in the four years prior to the data collection, and should make regular training station visits.

Inservice Teacher Education Studies

Four studies were located which dealt with the identification of professional development needs of teacher coordinators which gave insight concerning inservice teacher education needs. Kohns (1975) identified and analyzed common and unique professional development needs of beginning and experienced high school and postsecondary distributive education personnel in Minnesota. He also compared these needs based upon whether or not the personnel had a collegiate distributive education major. In a similar study, Kirkley (1977) determined professional development competency needs of teacher coordinators in South Carolina.

Berns and Smith (1979) used state supervisors, teacher educators, and local supervisors to identify twenty-two tasks performed by Virginia teacher coordinators in the role of DECA chapter advisor for which inservice training should be provided.

In an effort to improve the evaluation competencies of high school distributive education teacher coordinators in Virginia, Lucas and Weber (1970) provided inservice instruction in the area of evaluation. They measured the effect of training by testing teachers' cognitive abilities in principles of evaluation before and after the instruction. They also followed up the participants' implementation of these skills in the actual school setting.

EVALUATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION

Evaluation of distributive teacher education gained importance when measured by the number of studies conducted during this time period as compared to previous eras. In a national study, Strydesky (1977) used a six-round Delphi procedure to identify a set of standards and criteria for distributive teacher education programs and to determine the extent to which the standards and criteria were valid evaluators of distributive teacher education programs. She concluded that the identified standards and criteria were feasible evaluators of distributive teacher education programs. In addition, she reported that all categories of standards and criteria were representative of the basic beliefs from which the original statements (Crawford, 1975) were generated, and that all categories were necessary to adequately describe and cover the full range of activity of a distributive teacher education program.

Charters (1976) conducted an investigation to determine the effectiveness of a competency-based program in distributive teacher education. The primary objective of the project was to make an empirical determination of the effectiveness of a program located in Syracuse, New York. This was accomplished by comparing student achievement in three components of the program with similar traditionally organized courses. The three components were retailing, merchandising, and occupational work experience. In order to make the comparison, the three components were translated into a competency-based format and implemented into the existing teacher preparation program. The competencies were validated locally and statewide by a group of reactors including distributive education teachers, school administrators, businessmen, and students. Another approach to validation was a comparison of the competencies with the technical objectives of the Crawford (1967) investigation.

Berns (1979) synthesized the Crawford (1967) critical tasks and surveyed graduates of the teacher education program at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University and their assistant state supervisors, local supervisors, vocational directors, and principals to determine the level of proficiency at which these graduates were performing the synthesized tasks. He also identified the value placed on the required and elective courses in the distributive teacher education curriculum by the graduates as well as their perceptions of the value of the supporting services rendered by the program. In addition, the short-term and long-range career aspirations of the graduates and graduate courses and experiences required to achieve these career objectives were identified. He found that the graduates were generally performing well according to each of the respondent groups and no courses were identified as being of no value to the graduate.

The Crawford (1967) and Cotrell (1971) studies served as the basis for an investigation of the attitudes of distributive education teacher coordinators toward their preparation to perform tasks in ten functional areas. This study, conducted by Heath-Sipos (1979), found that teacher coordinators perceived themselves as adequately prepared in instructional planning, instructional evaluation, guidance, and technical knowledge, but not quite adequately prepared in program planning, instructional execution, instructional management, school and community relations, student vocational organization, coordination, and professional role and development. She also found that a relationship existed between attitudes of teachers toward their preparation and their attitudes toward their advisors, and that males had more positive attitudes than females. The population of this survey was 1976-77 teacher education graduates from thirteen central states who were certified to teach distributive education and had at least one year of teaching experience.

Wallette (1974) completed a status study of distributive teacher education programs by surveying teacher educators and state supervisors. He found that the number of distributive education courses offered ranged from two to twenty-one. Distributive education departments at small institutions typically identified with the school of business whereas distributive education departments at large institutions usually identified with the school of education. He also found that approximately 80 percent of the graduates of the programs studied were placed in distributive education positions.

One study was located which dealt with graduate distributive education. Cooley (1975) conducted a twenty-year follow-up study to appraise the masters program in distributive education at Northwestern State University of Louisiana. This mail survey resulted in a return rate of over 97 percent. General results from this study included such findings as graduates indicating that the faculty advising was very valuable to them, individual guidance of distributive education faculty was the outstanding "item" in the masters program, and those graduates in the teaching profession were more satisfied with their jobs than those respondents in the nonteaching profession even though the latter group was receiving higher salaries and higher annual gains in salary.

Summary

Teacher education research during this period emphasized the identification and analysis of perceptions of various populations toward a number of topics including teacher education as a whole, desirable behaviors of a teacher-coordinator, occupational experiences needed by distributive educators, recruitment of teacher candidates, admission standards, and inservice needs of teacher coordinators. The primary strategy of the researchers was to identify the opinions and perceptions of individuals from within the marketing and distributive education profession and employers and training sponsors of marketing and distributive education students. Few studies ventured away from these populations to bring insights from those outside the realm of marketing and distributive education and little direct experimentation was done to validate those opinions.

ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION

Very little research was found which specifically addressed the topic of administration or supervision. Of course, many of the studies reviewed in the program evaluation section of this book relate to administration, as do studies throughout other sections. Furthermore, much research with application to marketing and distributive education may be found in the area of vocational education administration and general educational administration. This research falls outside the parameters set for this review and synthesis, since only those studies related directly to marketing and distributive education are reported here.

Crawford (1975) surveyed teacher educators and state supervisors throughout the country and identified basic beliefs concerning administration. Two examples of these beliefs were that distributive education should be an integral part of the public school system, and a state supervisory service in distributive education should be maintained in order to assist and advise local communities to expand and develop programs responsive to employment trends and to the needs of target populations.

Biddle (1972) and Devitt (1978) surveyed state supervisors to compile data related to state supervision in distributive education. Devitt's study compared the 1978 findings with Biddle's 1972 findings to attempt to identify trends in state supervision. Among the trends she found were a trend away from utilizing "supervisor" in the title of the head state level distributive education personnel and a trend to identify a separate person other than the head state supervisor to serve as state DECA advisor. Devitt also found that over ninety-five local distributive education programs were closed in eight states in 1977 due to a lack of state and federal funding, and approximately 510 new programs could be opened in thirty-one states in 1979 if adequate state and federal funding were available. A shortage of teacher coordinators was found to exist at a rate of 128 teachers annually. She also found that state supervisors indicated that distributive education contributed to economic development as evidenced by wages earned and state and federal taxes paid by cooperative distributive education students, better trained employees, reduction of unemployment among youth, improved employment skills, and expanded knowledge and improved attitude of trained workers.

Two task analysis investigations were conducted which attempted to study the position of distributive education state supervisor and high school distributive education department head.

In a national study, Daentzer (1976) surveyed 105 state supervisors of distributive education and business education to determine their perceptions of the significance of 129 tasks and to determine the frequency of performance of the tasks. The data were analyzed by ranking the tasks based on significance and frequency. Furthermore, comparisons were made of the responses among eight different types of supervisors.

In a study conducted in Virginia, Smith (1979) determined the relative perceived importance of identified task clusters and of identified tasks within clusters that should be performed by department heads of secondary distributive education programs. Department heads, principals having jurisdiction over these department heads, and a leadership group composed of assistant state supervisors, local supervisors, and teacher educators of distributive education in Virginia were surveyed. Through this study, seventy-six tasks were identified for the position of department head. These tasks may serve as the basis for the development of instructional modules for preparing individuals to assume the responsibilities of department head and upgrading those persons actually in department head positions.

One study investigated the functions of local distributive education advisory committees. Using the Delphi technique, sixty-nine teacher coordinators from Oklahoma were surveyed. The most important functions found through this study included gaining support for and assistance in such areas as public relations, promotion of the program, identification of problems or training needs of the community, acquiring community resource persons, surveys and manuals, needs of distributive education programs, teacher coordinator updating in the field of marketing, employer training, and community feedback.

EVALUATION

The decade of the 70s has brought an increase in emphasis on vocational program evaluation. A trend was seen toward more sophistication in the kinds of evaluative studies and toward consideration of a wider array of evaluative outcomes. These trends are evident in the number and variety of marketing and distributive education program evaluation studies appearing in the literature.

This review of evaluation research includes three general kinds of research questions. They are: (1) Are the programs valid, effective, and/or efficient as indicated by some measure of student achievement; (2) Are the programs valid, effective, and/or efficient as indicated by the value judgments of people who are "expert" or qualified to judge; (3) Do the programs project a favorable "image"? The first two kinds of questions were answered with studies that compared program characteristics or outcomes with evaluative criteria. The third type of investigation simply described the program and left evaluation to the reader or to another subsequent investigation.

Studies Involving Measurements of Student Success

The ideal evaluation of any vocational program should include consideration of how well the intended objectives are achieved. Success is typically thought of as indicated by performance in the employment situation. If the student does the job well, receives adequate compensation in terms of personal satisfaction and economic benefits, and progresses satisfactorily in later education and employment, the distributive education program (or some aspect of it) is credited with a measure of success. The obvious problem is that the technology and opportunity for performance oriented evaluation in DE is quite limited. In contrast with such areas as curriculum research, where the technology exists and programmatic research is expanding, the evaluation of programs using student success in the research design is quite rare. Also the few outcome evaluation studies that were reviewed were generally limited in scope, and they typically looked at only curriculum aspects of the program.

Comparing Distributive Education Students with Untrained Workers

If distributive education has any impact on the performance of program participants, it seems reasonable to expect that many sales students would apply their learning in retail sales activities. Murphy (1975) investigated this question by comparing the extent to which students used accepted sales techniques in comparison with coworkers who had not been trained in distributive education. He found that salespeople who were studying distributive education performed at the same overall level of selling efficiency as their untrained coworkers. However, there were some differences. Students performed better in the opening phases of the sales presentation, but were less effective in demonstrating the merchandise, overcoming objections, and selling additional merchandise. This study thus confirmed the expectation that older, more experienced salespeople performed more effectively in the above areas of selling, and also that those working on commissions performed better than those on straight salary. Although Murphy did not confirm some hopes about the value of DE, it should be recognized that his investigation took a very small peek at only one part of the panorama. Many more studies of this type, following the basic research design that Murphy used, could provide very useful information about the specific areas of strength and weakness in the training of distributive education students.

A research design which was used in a study by Wilkinson (1974) might be used for other investigations about how well graduates perform in comparison with untrained high school graduates. Wilkinson conducted personal interviews with fifty-six recent graduates of Iowa programs and eighty-one DE high school graduates. A questionnaire was used to collect demographic information; an employer rating scale was used; and job satisfaction-analysis scale was used as the patterned interview form. Both groups were selected at random from the state-wide population of DE students using a stratified sampling procedure.

Consistent with the findings of Murphy (described above), Wilkinson found that students did not perform on the job any better than the nonDE coworkers. The nonDE group were just as satisfied in their jobs, they expressed basically the same job aspirations, and they performed the same functions at the same levels of responsibility as the DE group. Some of the positive findings were: DE graduates found employment faster; they exhibited more job stability; they obtained higher beginning wages; and they received more salary increases during the first fifteen months of employment.

Wilkinson reported that the Iowa DE students on the average obtained a 2.0 grade point average during 11th and 12th grades. In some areas, if not in Iowa, it may be that the DE student population is somewhat less capable than the general population of workers. Therefore, if they perform as well in employment, it might be inferred that the DE program was successful in that it might have contributed to overcoming a disadvantage endemic to the DE student population. Research on this question might provide an explanation for what appears to be a weakness in DE programs in the area of technical skill development.

A similar investigation was conducted by Wilkinson and Miles (1977). Again, a representative sample was drawn. However, the data source was DE training sponsors, and mail questionnaires were used. The training sponsors were asked to compare DE students with regular part-time high school students. Findings regarding specific job skills were similar to what Wilkinson found. The DE students were not better than their untrained counterparts.

With respect to some of the more subtle kinds of learning outcomes that are emphasized in DE, and which are rarely evaluated, the Florida coordinators appeared to be doing an excellent job. The employers evaluated the DE students as having better attitudes than nonDE student employees. On this factor the chi square value was large enough to be significant at the .0007 level. On such factors as dependability, loyalty, ability to accept criticism, and the like, the employers rated DE students much higher. Also, the employers gave very high marks to the DE coordinators for their contribution to the education and training of the students.

Harris and White (1975) conducted a follow-up study in Indiana to investigate employer perceptions, student backgrounds, coordinator backgrounds, employers characteristics, program characteristics, and postprogram student activities. In that study, a sample of 1,032 students from ten small cities were asked to respond to a questionnaire. The DE group included eighty-one respondents. The variables which should be of interest to distributive educators were graduates' personal characteristics, their employment status, and their perceptions of the distributive education experience. Following are a few of the findings. One-fourth of the respondents went on to postsecondary education, the majority as full-time students. Thus, Indiana high school DE programs should not be considered terminal. Twenty-two percent of the respondents had moved from the city in which they had resided while in school. Eighty-five percent of the graduates were employed. However, about 8 percent of the graduates were unemployed and looking for work. Forty-five percent of the respondents obtained their first jobs after graduation through some direct relationship to the distributive education program. However, only 7 percent attributed the initial job placement to the teacher coordinator efforts. With respect to the perceptions of the graduates of how well their education and their cooperative experiences prepared them for their jobs, a small percentage (11 percent) expressed serious concern about their job preparation. Slightly over 40 percent of the graduates felt that they applied all or most of the same skills which they had acquired in the DE program on their first jobs. An identical percentage reported that they used few or none of the same skills. It might be assumed that if graduates are not using skills acquired in the DE program, they may not perceive a strong connection between job preparation in the program and initial employment after graduation.

Ninety-one percent of the distributive education graduates were willing to recommend the program to other students. They indicated that the most important contributions of the program to their education were that they "learned to get along with others," "learned to be an effective worker," and "developed confidence." It was also found that "developing job skills" was cited as one of the two most significant contributions by only 8 percent of the graduates. Finally, the graduates were asked to select one teacher coordinator characteristic which was of greatest help during the program. A wide array of responses was received, with only one - "understanding of business and industry" - accounting for as much as 25 percent. Characteristics such as understanding of personal problems, understanding of career plans, and understanding of basic abilities of the student, were perceived to be more important than characteristics pertaining to technical expertise of the teacher coordinator. Overall, the interpersonal characteristics were indicated as most important by about half of the graduates while the technical expertise characteristics were selected by 37 percent. Thus, information gathered on teacher coordinator attributes of the program contributions seemed to be consistent. While skill development was essential, graduates seemed to put the most value on the teacher coordinator's ability to relate to them personally and to assist them in occupational skills.

Palmieri (1973) studied the relationship between distributive education preparation and post high school success. Ninety-seven distributive education graduates (selected from a population of 457 who had been enrolled in the twenty-two Detroit public high schools) were interviewed three years after graduation. It was found that many DE students were not being hired in distributive occupations. They were mainly securing employment in clerical occupations. This was found to be true even though sales jobs were apparently available for the graduates. Apparently few specialized job skills were demanded by employers of DE graduates and they were not likely to be promoted. It is interesting to note that in this study of Distributive Education in a large metropolitan area, the outcomes were more negative than in the previous study where small city DE graduates were the focus of the research.

Distributive Education Students Versus College Preparatory Students

Faehnle (1976) conducted an investigation to ascertain what, if any, the differences were in academic achievement in undergraduate college marketing programs between students with DE and those with college preparatory backgrounds in high school. Eighty marketing majors from universities in northwest Ohio were used to provide data on the relationship of high school background and college attended to four areas of the marketing major's academic achievement. The distributive education students and their college preparatory student counterparts did equally well in overall academic achievement, college marketing program achievement, and marketing-related course achievement. It was concluded that it did not matter whether a high school student pursued a DE or college preparatory course of studies, since the results of this study showed no significant difference in academic achievement in college. Neither high school curricular background necessarily aided or hindered students in the further formal study of marketing.

Attitudes of Students and Teachers

Several evaluative studies have been completed that measure attitudes toward business and marketing. Two studies were completed by Karp and Sears Merchandising Research (1974, 1975) for the National Management Advisory Council. In the first, the attitudes of DE and nonDE students toward specific business concepts were compared. In addition to a great deal of information on specific knowledges and attitudes of students, the overall conclusion of the study was that DE students were no more positive toward business than nonDE students, and in general, were less positive than had been expected.

In the second Karp study, the attitudes and knowledge of DE teachers were evaluated. Teachers overall were found to express a higher level of positive attitudes toward business than did DE students.

Two studies essentially replicated the Karp research in specific states. Allen and Tugman (1978) surveyed students and teachers in North Carolina and Boyer and Smith (1977) studied students, businesspersons, and private citizens in Utah. Findings and conclusions in both studies were generally like those in the original work.

Attitudes of students toward retailing were studied by Bennett (1971) and Hephner (1972). Bennett compared urban disadvantaged youth with urban nondisadvantaged regarding their perceptions of employment in retailing careers. He found a highly significant difference of opinions between the groups on several measures of attitudes toward employment, with the attitudes of nondisadvantaged being more positive.

Hephner (1972) compared DE students with nonDE students having similar backgrounds regarding their perceptions of retailing as a career goal. Using a quasi-experimental design, he measured student attitudes prior to beginning and at the conclusion of a school year. In a comparison of test scores, those participating in DE scored significantly higher than those not participating on both pre- and posttests.

PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS RELATED TO STUDENT SUCCESS

The following six studies were based on the premise that distributive education program evaluation should involve some measure of student success which is assumed to be an outcome of program participation. These kinds of studies are rare because the measurement of success is not as convenient and easy as the less direct measures which are typically employed. A more detailed explanation of the problem, the rationale for less direct evaluation, is discussed in the following section. The rationale for the investigations described here is that what happens during the student's experience in the program will have a direct impact on some aspect of the student's employment performance or success after completing the program. All six of these studies rely on information which described the program, or some aspect of it, and which gathered information about graduates of the program.

Gleason (1979) studied the relationship of selected program variables to enter into distributive occupations. The program variables were participation in DECA, proximity of the program to a major city (apparently on the assumption that proximity provides access to training opportunities), specialization of the curriculum admission requirements, and type of school. Another set of variables which did not relate directly to program characteristics included sex of the student, relationship of the cooperative training experience to the student's occupational objective, and the student's expressed occupational objective. A variety of approaches were used in the analysis to determine if the program and student characteristics were related to whether or not the student entered the field for which training was provided in the program during the year following high school graduation. A two-state random sample procedure was used to select 364 graduates. Seventy-four percent responded to the questionnaire. Substantial relationships were found between entry into distributive occupations and two of the variables. Apparently when the student had an expressed occupational objective, and when the student actively participated in DECA, the student was likely to be employed in an occupation within the field of training. Therefore, it was concluded that students should be encouraged to participate in the DECA organization and it was also recommended that an effective selection and career development program should precede enrollment in distributive education.

Cushman (1973) conducted a similar investigation using data collected before and after graduation from 380 students who were enrolled in randomly selected secondary distributive education programs throughout New York state. The variables under study included age, sex, knowledge of subject matter, whether the student was enrolled in a cooperative program or not, the number of cooperative and noncooperative experiences, DECA membership, length of enrollment, amount of instruction, school store experience, and geographic location of the school. As in the previously described investigation, these variables were studied with respect to their relationship to entry into a related job or college curriculum. Nine of fifteen variables were found to correlate with the related employment or college enrollment criteria. Of those listed above, the related variables were age, sex, knowledge of subject matter, whether the student was enrolled in a cooperative program or not, DECA membership, length of enrollment, amount of instruction, school store experience, and geographic location of the school.

Another study in which a variety of program characteristics was related to placement status of graduates was completed by Hlebichuk (1971). In this study, the entire populations of eighteen teacher coordinators and 387 students in the state of Montana were used as the data source. Emphasis was on variables relating to teacher coordinator characteristics, the program, and student characteristics. In all, thirty-eight variables were studied. Most variables were found not to be related to employment status after graduation. The major findings were that more female than male graduates were more likely to become initially employed in distributive occupations, and that the occupational area of the student's cooperative experience influenced initial placement in a distributive occupation. Among the teacher coordinator's professional areas of preparation, the marketing technical preparation was found to be the best estimator of the graduate's initial placement in a distributive occupation.

Another study to determine whether distributive education teacher characteristics were related to student employment success was a study by Daggett (1974). The purpose of this investigation was to ascertain the relationships between selected distributive education teacher characteristics and the retention of their graduates in the field of distribution. Data were collected from 151 teachers and 453 graduates (three per teacher) in New York and Pennsylvania. Multiple regression analysis showed the characteristics to be statistically related to retention of graduates in the field. They were "graduate major in business administration or marketing," "taught more than just distributive education," "over eighteen hours of undergraduate business courses," "earned highest degree prior to 1953," "undergraduate major in marketing or business administration," "at least two years full-time work experience in the field of distribution," "taught over ten years," "had less than a 3.0 undergraduate grade point average," and "at least forty years of age." In addition to showing the relationships of the teacher coordinator characteristics to retention of graduates in distributive education, the Daggett study presented a detailed profile of background characteristics of the New York and Pennsylvania teachers.

A somewhat different approach was used in a study by Vredenburg (1975). He studied the differences between effective and ineffective Colorado and Wyoming distributive education coordinators with reference to program, coordination, and curriculum. A questionnaire was mailed to all training sponsors of the coordinators involved in the study. On the basis of the scores, the coordinators were ranked and than divided into halves with the top half labeled as effective and the bottom half labeled as ineffective. The statistical analysis determined the relationship between effective and ineffective coordinators with respect to each of sixty-four variables in the coordinator questionnaire. Some of the major conclusions of this study were that to be an effective coordinator the person need not have taken a course in advertising; individual conferences were used more often by effective coordinators than by ineffective coordinators as a recruiting technique; effective coordinators tended to use 50 to 75 percent of the planning periods for coordination; effective coordinators tended to include window display and interior display as part of the subject matter taught.

Two generally related studies analyzed the effectiveness of the distributive education curriculum in developing selected knowledges and skills. Russell (1971) evaluated the sales knowledge and ability of three groups: DE salespeople, nonDE salespeople, and nonsalespeople in order to develop an instrument to measure sales ability. The test differentiated between salespeople and nonsalespeople, but no significant differences were found between those salespeople trained through DE and those not so trained.

Frunzi (1977) tested distributive education high school seniors in various phases of the DE program to determine their level of management understanding. Using the test "How to Supervise" published by the Psychological Corporation, he observed that the DE seniors tested scored significantly higher than the national norm.

ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION PROGRAMS

The studies reviewed in the preceeding section were designed to determine whether or not distributive education (or some aspect of it) is successful as measured by student success of one kind or another. The following few studies also indicate student success but in a different way. These studies deal with the economic benefits to the individual and to society that result from participating in marketing and distributive education. The idea of evaluating vocational programs by comparing the economic costs with economic benefits derived from the program is not new. For the past two decades the literature contains a number of discourses advocating the use of cost-benefit analysis. Also, a number of very well written theoretical models for cost-benefit analysis have been developed. But in the field of distributive education few examples were found of cost-benefit analysis applied at the local level to evaluate specific programs. There were a few studies dealing with the economics of distributive education in a wider geographic area. None of the studies was designed to conform to the ideal model for cost-benefit analysis. This is mainly because the technology for implementing such a model simply does not exist. Ideally, cost-benefit analysis of a vocational program involves comparing the actual program costs with the discounted value of the benefits derived from program participation over the period of employment. Obviously the benefits that accrue over a lifetime of employment have to be calculated or estimated, and this is the weak link in the system.

When other indicators of economic success such as the level of earnings immediately following entry level employment are used, a true picture of the economic value of program participation cannot be obtained.

An interesting approach to the analysis of the economic impact of distributive education in the state of Arizona was found in an investigation by Bryan (1970). Rather than using actual data on expenditures and income, Bryan made estimates of these figures. Using his estimates and a complex line of reasoning with respect to the impact of "turnover" on revenue generated by taxes, Bryan concluded that "the federal government received over two dollars for every dollar invested, while the state reduced its expenditure by 26.5 percent." Although the Bryan study did not conform with the typical concept of cost benefit analysis, it provided an interesting approach to demonstrating the economic value of a vocational program. It was complex, highly technical, and relied to a very large extent on estimates and assumptions.

Still another approach to cost benefit analysis was used by Strate (1974). This study was a cost-benefit analysis of two types of distributive education offered in Missouri. The purpose of the investigation was to determine whether or not there were added benefits received by graduates of two-year Distributive Education programs considering the added costs of delivering the two-year program relative to the one-year program. Cost data were obtained from vocational reimbursement request forms. Benefits were measured in terms of student income during the first and fourth year following graduation. No statistically significant differences were found between the one-year program and the two-year program graduate's income, and the added cost of the two-year program was not significantly higher than the one-year program. Therefore, it was concluded that one type of program was no better than the other with respect to cost and benefits.

This investigation also included an interesting examination of the relationship between a great variety of demographic variables and the annual earnings of the graduates. The variables included such items as the number of jobs held, occupation of father, psychological test scores, hours of on-the-job training in the last five months, membership and participation in DECA, whether the teacher coordinator was certified, and whether an advisory committee was used. No important relationships were found between these variables and the level of the student's income after graduation from the program.

Although it was not a cost-benefit analysis, it seemed appropriate to review a cost analysis of distributive education programs in Delaware. This investigation by Grandfield (1972) was descriptive and concerned mainly with examining costs. No consideration was given to measures of quality or impact in terms of economic benefits. The interest value of this investigation lies in the approach to providing a detailed and comprehensive cost analysis which might be used in other investigations where economic benefits could also be studied. The statistical data were presented in tables showing average expenditures at the state and local level for a variety of cost items. It also investigated the problem of prorating costs and comparing program costs with enrollment figures. Such items as teacher education expenditures and other very specific costs were presented on a per student basis.

Studies Involving Personal Judgment

The studies reviewed above involved the use of "hard" data about some aspect of student performance versus success which might have resulted from participation in distributive education. The following studies employed some form of "soft" data where the personal judgments of "experts" were included in the evaluation model. This is not to imply that personal judgment is not an appropriate data source for evaluating distributive education programs. In fact, probably the most creditable investigations, and certainly the greatest number of studies, involve personal judgment rather than actual performance-based data. Several different types of studies are reported below. What they have in common is the use of evaluative criteria or quality indicators which were applied in evaluating the process (in contrast with the outcomes or products of the DE programs.)

Evaluative criteria

A few studies had as their main purpose the development and/or validation of evaluative criteria which could later be used in evaluating distributive education programs. A typical example of this type of investigation was a study by the Arizona State Department of Education (1975). Its purpose was to develop a model for evaluation of DE programs in Arizona. The project involved the design of survey instruments, the collection and analysis of data, and recommendations for program modification based on the findings. Surveys were made of students, teacher coordinators, national leaders, and business and industry representatives to determine if the needs of all were being met by existing programs. Six sample instruments were produced. They included a self concept inventory, a work values inventory, a distributive education student program evaluation, a coordinator evaluation, a questionnaire pertaining to DECA, and a business community questionnaire. As with most studies of this type, long, detailed lists of criteria were incorporated into the instruments. If this type of investigation were to be carried out to its logical end, some form of validition of each criterion would be included in the study. However, this is rarely done. In other words, the validity of the criteria is taken for granted rather than actually tested.

Another investigation that involved the development of evaluative criteria for distributive education was the National Study of Secondary School Evaluation. The product of this study is a checklist and question format for each of eighteen program areas. The instruments deal with philosophy and objectives, the curriculum, organization of the program, the physical facilities of the program, the instructional program, special characteristics of the program, and general evaluation.

Little (1978) conducted a survey of over four hundred DE coordinators and local administrators in Michigan for the purpose of identifying evaluative criteria for distributive education programs. The study involved first, determining what objectives the respondents believed to be most important in relation to their programs, then deriving evaluative criteria by assessing the relative importance of each criterion. In addition to development of the criteria, it was found that distributive education teachers and administrators essentially agreed on the relative importance of the criteria. It was assumed that the list of criteria was complete because few recommended additions to the list appeared on the questionnaires.

An entirely different approach with the same general purpose was used by Whitted (1969). The previous study was oriented to the secondary level, whereas the Whitted study was oriented to the two-year postsecondary distributive education program. Whitted approached the investigation by making a comprehensive analysis of current writings and research. Statements of criteria were developed and classified from information which appeared in the literature. To validate and refine the information, the preliminary criteria were submitted to a group of distributive educators selected because of their experience in the evaluation of DE programs. The panel included state supervisors and teacher coordinators. After the criteria were incorporated into an instrument, the instrument was pilot tested and revised. The result of this type of investigation was twofold. First, the evaluative criteria were developed and validated. Second, the criteria were incorporated into an instrument which was appropriately revised and tested so it has demonstrated utility for program evaluation.

A comprehensive program review system has been in operation in the state of Ohio since the early 70s. The PRIDE System (1973) was developed through a research process and provides for a wide range of evaluation criteria for all vocational service areas including distributive education. The program review system includes six basic components: administrative review, process variable review, product review, cost analysis review, availability and impact review, and acceptance and congruence review.

There are several approaches to evaluating programs where criteria, representing the ideal situation, are compared with actual practices or conditions found in the program under evaluation. The literature refers to this general type of evaluation as "formative" or "process" evaluation. In contrast with evaluation using actual outcomes or results, this approach is less direct and less trustworthy. The underlying assumption with formative evaluation is that the quality indicators or criteria are valid in that there is a direct relationship between the existence of the condition or practice and the expected outcomes. But it is fairly obvious that this may not necessarily be the case. For example, we assume that relevant occupational experience affects the quality of teacher performance and, eventually, the productivity and success of DE students. This, however, may not necessarily be the case. In fact, we have found no substantial research to document this assumption. Nevertheless, we rely on our judgment about the validity of occupational experience as "process" criterion. The same rationale applies to criteria such as the practice of using training plans, an advisory committee, "effective" instructional methods, competency-based lesson plans, etc. However, evaluation of the process (as opposed to the outcomes) of distributive education programs is often the only feasible approach. Following are examples of several different approaches to this general type of evaluation.

Criteria related to practice

Gold (1976) investigated distributive education program operation in New York City public high schools. The first step in this investigation was the review of the literature to select practices and derive evaluative criteria with respect to student selection, instruction, skill development activities, instructional methods, correlation of instruction with emerging manpower needs, and leadership training activities. These criteria were incorporated into a survey instrument which was used to collect information from 212 distributive education teachers and supervisors. In-depth interviews were conducted in forty-three of the New York City high schools. The results of the surveys were reported in terms of percentages of the total number of programs meeting the specified criteria. This investigation related to the entire school system but did not offer specific recommendations for improvement to individual schools and programs. Recommendations made were that public relations programs should be undertaken, teacher training programs should be improved, DECA activities should be modified and strengthened, and additional investigation of student success should be conducted.

Banister (1969) evaluated the DE facilities, equipment, and resources used in Arkansas. He concluded that distributive education programs in Arkansas were providing adequate facilities, equipment, and instructional resources.

Syhlman (1976) used a somewhat different approach to evaluate the distributive education programs in Washington. The Syhlman study obtained opinions and perspectives of Washington's training sponsors supervising distributive education students, toward various functions and characteristics of the distributive education program as presented in a detailed questionnaire. The evaluative criteria which were used in the questionnaire covered a wide range of program characteristics and practices. As a result of the investigation, some interesting and challenging data for distributive education personnel were obtained. For example, it was found that 16 percent of employers were never personally contacted by coordinators and 30 percent were contacted only one or two times. Forty-six percent of the employers received two or fewer visitations from coordinators during the academic year. Seventy-five percent of the employers said that there was no established form of a written training agreement. Fifty-nine percent of the training sponsors said that there was no formal training plan being used by coordinators. Sixty-two percent of the employers said they were aware of what was being taught in the distributive education curriculum; thirty-eight percent said they were not aware of the disciplines being taught. This type of investigation can serve as a model for other studies on a local, regional, or statewide basis. It is relatively inexpensive and offers potential for not only identifying areas of weakness but also identifying areas of strengths and quality which can enhance the credibility and favorable image of the programs which are found to be operating in accordance with the standards presented in the evaluation instrument.

Two statewide evaluations were completed as doctoral studies. Bruce (1968) evaluated high school programs in Texas by interviewing coordinators and asking students to complete questionnaires. In assessing the status of teachers, students, and program characteristics, Bruce found the program to be generally well staffed and supported but offered to only a small percentage of potential students in the state.

Adames (1975) reviewed the status of programs in New Hampshire. Questionnaires were sent to teachers, DE seniors, parents, business persons and counselors. General agreement was found among all groups that the purpose of DE is to prepare students for a job but not necessarily in marketing. Career education concepts were identified by a large majority of respondents as goals of DE. The major areas of disagreement were on the responsibility for guidance and counseling. Teachers and counselors disagreed on all items relating to areas where their responsibilities overlapped.

Program Characteristics Related to Positive Image

Davis (1977) investigated Georgia's distributive education and vocational office training programs using the cooperative method by analyzing high school principals' perceptions. The purpose of the study was to determine the relationship between the principals' knowledge and attitudes concerning the cooperative method and whether or not appropriate practices were followed in operating the programs. A mail survey was used to obtain responses to an instrument which assessed knowledge of and attitude toward the programs. Also, a brief survey instrument dealt with program practices. It was found that the school principal's knowledge of the theory of the cooperative method was positively related to attitudes concerning the method. Therefore, it was concluded that improvements in attitude might be accomplished by increasing principal's knowledge of the theory of the cooperative method. On the other hand, it was found that use of advisory committees, training plans, appropriate levels of coordination, methods of instruction used in the related class, and other similar factors were not systematically related to the principals' knowledge or attitudes about the cooperative method.

Another investigation using a similar design was conducted in the state of New Jersey by Gordon (1978). In his assessment the perceptions of teacher coordinators and principals were gathered, again using a mail survey. The questionnaires were sent to the distributive education coordinators and their school administrators to determine whether or not there were discrepancies between what the coordinators and principals perceived about program operation and practice. The entire state populations of DE coordinators and their principals were used in the investigation. The research instrument was one that had been developed and modified earlier and used to accredit schools in the Middle States Association and other regional associations. The findings of the investigations were reported in the form of frequency distributions, and differences between the responses of the two groups were tested using a median test to determine the strengths and weaknesses of New Jersey distributive education. Program elements were judged to be strengths when over 90 percent of the respondents evaluated a checklist item as excellent or good. On this basis, distributive education in New Jersey was judged as being weak because the findings indicated that only forty of the ninty-five checklists statements and questions were determined as strengths. The report was particularly critical of the fact that practically none of the local distributive education advisory committees was actually functioning. It was also concluded that 45 percent of the established guidelines were followed by 90 to 100 percent of the responding schools. The perceptions of the principals and the teacher coordinators were essentially in agreement. They perceived the program in the same manner on 96 percent of the statements and questions. Again, a statewide investigation compared the practices in Distributive Education with an ideal model as presented in the evaluative criteria listed on a survey instrument, and the results were interpreted to indicate deficiencies in program operation and practice.

Perceptions of Validity and/or Effectiveness of Distributive Education

Egan (1968) conducted a statewide evaluation of distributive education in Utah. The investigation consisted of an evaluation of course offerings or content of the distributive education program. The data were obtained by questionnaire from 228 Utah businessmen who were employing distributive education students and from 503 distributive education students enrolled at the time of the study. Both questionnaires were administered by the local teacher coordinator. Course content evaluated included orientation and job placement, merchandise mathematics, retail salesmanship, operation and structure of distribution, merchandise information, display, advertising, and personality improvement. The unit on personality improvement was ranked highest in importance by both business and student respondents. Other units ranked high by business people were merchandise mathematics, retail salesmanship, merchandise information, and orientation and job placement. Job placement was ranked high by students, but they ranked merchandise mathematics somewhat lower than did the business people. Operational structure of distribution was ranked lowest by both business people and students.

Lucas (1975) conducted a longitudinal study of distributive and office education programs in North Carolina with respect to how well program graduates were satisfied in their employment, and how well their employers were satisfied with the DE graduates as workers.

A follow-up study of Connecticut distributive education graduates of 1965, 1968, and 1971 was conducted by Righthand (1977). This study obtained a great deal of information dealing with the occupational status and former student's evaluation of DE programs. The investigation consisted of three parts: a program evaluation component, a comparison of the two-year program with the one-year program in Distributive Education, and an analysis of the work experience of DE program graduates.

Some of the findings of the program evaluation indicated that 85 percent would take DE again, 94 percent felt that the quality of the program was adequate or better, and 95 percent thought the quality of classroom instruction was good or better. In addition, there were other favorable comments. The value of DECA was judged to be "very valuable" by 34 percent and "somewhat valuable" by 49 percent. Only 18 percent of the respondents judged DECA to be "of little value" or "no value." Seventy-seven percent thought that the training stations were good or excellent. It was found that those employed in distribution or closely related fields tended to earn slightly more than those employed in unrelated and occupational fields. As expected, the 1965 and 1968 graduates, ten and seven years after graduation, earned more than the recent 1971 graduates who had only four years in the job market.

In comparing the one-year and two-year programs, it was found that graduates of the two-year program tended to remain in their field of distribution longer than those with one year of study. There were no significant differences between the two groups in post high school training activities, formal advancement on the job, salary, unemployment, or job satisfaction. It was also found that those working in the field of distribution would be more willing to take DE again. There were no significant differences in income, unemployment, or job satisfaction between racial or ethnic groups. Neither were there any significant differences in unemployment or job satisfaction between sexes. Males were more apt to be found working in the field for which they were trained. Forty-three percent of the respondents indicated that they had no DE or marketing training after completion of high school which indicated that probably 57 percent did obtain some type of further education or training in distribution.

With respect to employment experience, the findings of this investigation were rather negative. About three-fourths of the students indicated they considered placement effectiveness poor or that it did not apply. Looking at this criteria from another angle, it was found that only 19 percent of the respondents mentioned teacher's placement activities when asked from whom they had received the greatest assistance in placement after graduation. It was also found that only 38 percent of those employed in 1975 were in the broad field of distribution. Also, there was a significant reduction in the percent in the field of distribution in 1975 than was reported in the first job. This indicated a tendency for DE graduates to leave the field of distribution. Finally, an unemployment rate of 15 percent was reported. Though this was better than that of recent high school graduates, it was higher than the unemployment rate for the state (10 percent) for the same year.

Rossi (1974) investigated the attitudes and opinions of principals regarding various components of the distributive education programs in New Jersey. The study involved a survey questionnaire administered to all 201 teacher coordinators of DE and 171 high school principals representing all secondary schools in New Jersey offering distributive education. Findings of the study presented the various questionnaire items showing where differences of opinion and attitude between the two groups were found. Some implications drawn from the findings were that teachers were concerned over the need to exercise greater authority in controlling the calibre of students entering their programs. Both groups recognized the need for supporting the DE cooperative program by providing the coordinators with ample time to properly supervise the program. It was agreed that DE students were often stereotyped as students of lesser abilities within the hierarchy of the typical student body. A sizable number of distributive education students apparently enrolled in the program only because it afforded them the opportunity to leave school early and to earn an income. The time necessary for students to participate in the cooperative phase of the program was found to interfere with other cocurricular activities. The DECA Chapter was recognized as being instrumental in strengthening the vocational experience. However, the need was expressed to review the activities of DECA so that they could be redesigned to better meet the needs of the students. Both groups felt that a part of the principals' training should include the administration of cooperative distributive education. There was serious concern regarding the role and responsibility of local advisory committees. It was found that a favorable relationship generally existed between teachers of DE and their high school principals, and an overall favorable attitude was expressed toward distributive education and its value as part of the total program.

A comprehensive follow-up study of the 1971 and 1972 high school distributive education students in Florida was directed by Buckner (1978) with Bruni as the project researcher. Mail questionnaires were used to gather descriptive data. Of the eighty-four graduates who responded to the survey, 88 percent were employed and 65 percent were working in a marketing occupation. Most of the graduates were found to be earning seven to nine thousand dollars per year and 25 percent had completed a baccalaureate degree at the time of the investigation. Of those who left marketing for other occupations, the prominent reason given was lack of advancement and available jobs. Most had enrolled in distributive education because of interest in on-the-job training and that component of the program was considered to be most valuable by the former students. They also considered DECA competition and contact with local businesspersons as being most useful in a career. They appreciated the help they had received from their teacher coordinators and in general felt that they had acquired important job skills. Since 32 percent of the graduates felt that on-the-job training benefited them more than any other learning activity, it was concluded that more emphasis should be placed on implementing the use of training plans in conjunction with the students' training stations. A few other highlights suggesting modification of coordinator practices follow. Thirty-three percent of the graduates stated that the teacher-coordinator did not assist them in job placement. Sixty-six of the respondents were employed in retailing and service industries while very few students were placed in wholesaling and other areas of distribution.

Gildan (1975) conducted an investigation of the graduates of a postsecondary program in distributive education at nine community colleges in Florida. The purpose of the study was to evaluate the effectiveness of the program in meeting the career objectives of the graduates. Two hundred seventy-five individuals responded to a questionnaire containing seventy-seven variables concerned with educational and career activities. For analysis of the data, the graduates were divided into two groups: graduates working at entry level positions and graduates operating at the midmanagement level. The majority of graduates were employed in the field of marketing and distribution. They found the middle management program to be effective in meeting their career objectives as indicated by the fact that 75 percent would recommend the program and 58 percent felt that it contributed to their job success. Sixty-eight percent felt their current job offered the opportunity to use what they had learned in the program and 66 percent felt it was important in obtaining more advanced positions of employment. Seventy-eight percent felt the program emphasized skills needed in marketing and distribution.

Status and Image of Distributive Education

The following studies examined how distributive education is perceived by various groups, or simply described the program in a given locality. It is apparent that the public relations activities, the quality of performance of students and graduates, the involvement with advisory committees, DECA, and other aspects of the program which bring the distributive education program in direct contact with the community can have an impact on how the program is perceived by people in the business community and by school administrators. From the standpoints of evaluation, the studies which are reviewed below indicate the success of certain aspects of the program when DE is well known and perceived in a favorable way.

Hutt (1975) studied the perceptions of employers regarding distributive education programs in five Michigan communities. The employers were interviewed and the interviews were tape recorded for later analysis. Selected "themes" were identified in the conversations. Hutt found that the employers perceived DE in much broader terms than those found in the literature or as proclaimed by distributive education leaders. These terms did not always refer specifically to the field of distribution and marketing. Employers displayed an overall satisfaction with distributive education programs when they were familiar with them. Employers believed there was little difference between the roles of the training supervisor and the supervisor of all other employees. They were found to be relatively unaware of the characteristics or components of DE programs. When given the opportunity to select the subject matter which they thought to be most appropriate, basic mathematics and communication skills were selected most often. This was found in contrast with the preferences of distributive education leaders who believe that instruction should focus on the specific content of distribution and marketing.

Miles (1971) studied the DE training sponsors' and students' perceptions of the directed occupational experience portion of the DE program. An additional purpose of this study was to develop the instruments to measure the degree to which training sponsors and DE students perceived distributive education as a training program. A literature search was used to identify factors which distinguish between DE as a training method or as a means of obtaining work experience. A Likert scale was used to collect data from a random sample of six Ohio distributive education programs. The training sponsors who used a training plan had significantly higher perceptions of DE than those who did not use training plans. In general, both DE students and training sponsors perceived distributive education as a training program in Ohio.

Soutter (1971) investigated the perceptions of training sponsors, coordinators, and principals with respect to the objectives and purposes of distributive education. She also compared the perceptions of the three groups to determine areas of agreement and disagreement. Subjects for the investigation were all the principals and coordinators in the state of Arizona, along with a random sample of 287 training sponsors. She concluded that a closer working relationship between the coordinator and training sponsor was needed in explaining the related class assignments and in discussing what the training supervisor is to provide. Also, more of the lower one-third in scholastic ability and more of the disadvantaged students should be admitted to the programs. The training sponsors should become more involved in interviewing students for placement on the job. Participants in these programs should meet and discuss the use of written training plans and the planning of related instruction in the classroom. Finally, participants should have more frequent meetings to discuss job placement of students.

The following three studies described the status of DE programs with no attempt at any kind of evaluation. Iwler (1970) investigated the status of and need for distributive education in the state of Pennsylvania. This investigation was a replication of one conducted in 1958, so that improvements and changes could be identified. No significant difference was found with respect to the number of retailers familiar with distributive education. However, more retailers did participate in DE by employing students, and those retailers were apparently more satisfied with their students than the 1958 retailers had been. They expressed an interest in participating in distributive education programs in spite of the fact that educators stressed the lack of retailer interest as a reason for unsuccessful attempts to add the program to their curriculums. Another interesting finding was that retailers not only did not participate in adult programs, but they were not aware that such programs were available to them. The educators said that they did not know enough about adult education to make decisions about offering it.

Lamuth (1975) studied the perceptions of DE coordinators and students in two types of programs in Pennsylvania. One type was the typical high school and the other was the area vocational/technical school. The respondents were asked to simply describe their concepts of philosophy, organization, curriculum, etc. It was found that the two types of programs were essentially the same with respect to the factors under study.

Waddell (1976) conducted an investigation to determine the status of distributive education in selected community colleges in South Florida. Personal interviews were conducted with twenty three coordinators in thirteen institutions based on accepted program criteria for distributive education.

Evaluation of Individual Programs

A majority of the investigations reported in this section were statewide evaluations or studied some large geographic area. Obviously the evaluation of distributive education programs should be conducted at the local level so that individual coordinators and administrators might have guidelines for improving their programs. The fact that so few studies of local programs are found in the literature should not be surprising since the information obtained from such studies is of relatively little interest outside the locality. A few single program evaluations were reviewed but the details of these studies will not be reported. One was conducted by Goodenough (1969) to evaluate the marketing program in the General College of the University of Minnesota. Another was completed by Domian (1974) at Fox High

School, Arnold, Missouri. The other was an evaluation by Cress (1973) of a demonstration program to train educationally and socially handicapped youth to work in automotive service station driveway salesmanship and at care programs.

Summary

It is encouraging to see the increasing number and apparently the increasing quality of efforts to evaluate marketing and distributive education programs. It appears, however, that the great majority of research in this area continues to be through doctoral dissertations. Studies of marketing and distributive education evaluation produced a variety of results with respect to quality and impact of the programs. The reader will likely recognize that studies were reviewed with very similar approaches where the findings were negative in some cases and positive in others. It is suspected that some of these divergent findings might be the result of differences in research design and in the method of analysis or interpretation. However, it seems apparent that substantial difference in the quality of marketing and distributive education do exist.

It appears that marketing and distributive education is entering a new era in the evaluation of educational programs. The emphasis on a narrow range of objectives and evaluative criteria which characterized the past is no longer found to be acceptable. A number of investigations have been completed that use a wide array of evaluative criteria.

SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF RESEARCH

In comparing the research of 1969-1978 with that of earlier years, few significant differences can be cited. As noted in the two earlier editions of this publication, much of the research in marketing and distributive education continues to be descriptive or comparative in nature. The nature of the research should not be criticized since a great amount of significant data about marketing and distributive education programming is now available.

Increasingly, quasi-experimental and experimental research is being completed. The sophistication of research design is apparent in a few studies. It is important to note that a group of marketing and distributive education researchers is emerging and beginning to make valuable additions to the quantity and quality of studies within the profession.

It is obvious from a review of the research completed during the ten-year period that a great many of the studies are completed in relative isolation. That isolation is evidenced by two characteristics of the research. Much of research completed is applicable to relatively small and/or unique populations. Also, there is little evidence of continuity in research. Those researchers completing multiple studies seldom maintained a single focus throughout their research. Some research completed in the late 1960s and early 1970s has been used as a base for later studies by other researchers. This is not a typical pattern, however, and when used, prior research is often accepted as a data base rather than being replicated or refined. Very little research has been cumulative beyond a second generation.

The application of research in marketing and distributive education must be noted. Research often has been completed as a preliminary step within a developmental project. Particularly in the areas of curriculum, instruction, program design, and teacher education, direct evidence of the application of research is widespread. With greater dissemination of research results, it would appear that program development could be markedly enhanced.

Most research completed within marketing and distributive education is included in the ERIC system or abstracted in "Dissertation Abstracts International." However, a limited number of studies reviewed in this paper could not be located through the standard bibliographic indexes. Within the indexes, there are no common descriptors for all marketing and distributive education research. Unless the name "distributive education" appears in the title of a study, it usually will not be classified under that key word descriptor. Although a number of descriptors were used in searching indexes for appropriate studies, it is likely that some studies directly relevant to marketing and distributive education were not located. It is furthermore a difficult task to identify the specific nature of research from the title and a general abstract of the study.

This problem is particularly acute when applied to master's degree research. Since research generally is not classified within major indexes, it is not easily accessible. While most marketing and distributive education teacher education institutions offer the master's degree, only a very few were able to supply the authors a list of theses or research papers completed during the ten-year period studied. It appears that much of the masters' research is not even retained within the institution where the research is completed.

Casual observation would indicate that the amount of master's level research is probably decreasing. With institutions providing alternatives to the traditional thesis, it appears that many master's candidates are electing not to complete a research thesis. This may be a significant trend in the nature of research in marketing and distributive education in light of the finding by Ashmun and Larson (1970) that the number of master's degree studies were increasing.

Classification of Research Completed

Using the research reviewed in this paper, it would appear that the quantity of research completed each year has stabilized. This conclusion should be judged within the limitations identified earlier regarding the identification of studies. The trend toward nondegree research should be noted. A significant amount of research has been completed during the ten-year period under the sponsorship of the U.S. Office of Education and the various state departments of education. A few studies have been completed as faculty research projects sponsored by educational institutions or corporate foundations. The number of studies completed during each of the ten years is reported in Table 1. Studies are categorized as either doctoral research or other.

In order to analyze the breadth of research, Table 2 describes the research according to the ten content areas used in this publication. For each of the content areas, studies are reported by year completed and whether it is a doctoral study or "other." Studies often are reported in more than one category, which accounts for the greater total of studies than reported in Table 1. Attention should be given to the number of studies completed during the ten-year period that were not a part of a degree requirement. This suggests the growing importance of research in the marketing and distributive education profession. It is apparent that personnel within the profession are devoting time to research activities.

The research is summaried in Table 3 by showing the frequency and percentage of total studies reported in each of the ten topic areas. Although studies are certainly distributed across many topics, certain topics continue to be neglected in research. Specifically, human resources and employment, administration and supervision, and guidance have received little attention. This is consistent with the research reported in both previous editions of this publication.

Again, curriculum, evaluation, and teacher education were topics when a significant amount of research was involved. The topic of instruction (a combination of areas reported in the earlier editions) was also a major area of research during the period reviewed.

Analysis of Major Research Topics

There are, of course, strengths and weaknesses in the research completed in marketing and distributive education. A growing base of research exists that should prove valuable in future program development. It appears that most of the application of research results has occurred in curriculum development.

Much of the curriculum research in the past several years has primarily focused on competency or task analysis. Competency-based instruction has become an accepted element in marketing and distributive education. Future competency research needs to be examined to ensure that representative populations are used to identify competencies, that comprehensive coverage is given to the broad range of marketing occupations, that unneeded duplication is avoided, and that a greater consistency of research design is maintained. Consideration needs to be given to other curriculum models; additional evaluative studies should be conducted to measure the effectiveness of competency-based programs.

Research focused on evaluation has been refined during the ten-year period. While much of the evaluation is still opinion-based, the development of evaluative criteria and standards should provide an objective base for future evaluation. Initial efforts in cost-benefit analysis have been undertaken. Such studies provide extremely important information for educational decision makers. Researchers should formulate and test additional evaluative models including comprehensive cost-benefit analysis and measures of worker productivity. Goal-free assessment should be examined in order to provide a unique perspective for the analysis of the marketing and distributive education programs.

Innovative research designs and valuable data are results available from research in the area of instruction. Comparative studies that have been completed though opinion analysis are still predominate. The development of quasi-experimental and experimental research should be most easily accomplished in this program area.

Finally, the area of philosophy and objectives for marketing and distributive education must be carefully scrutinized. There is no standard set of goals and objectives accepted by the profession. The philosophy identified by Crawford in 1967 and revalidated in 1975 appears to have a high level of acceptance in the profession, as shown in Crawford's research and later studies incorporating the philosophical statements. However, it must be noted that despite the high level of acceptance of the philosophical statements, many studies have shown that significant portions of the philosophy are not implemented effectively. Attention must be focused in future research on the apparent discrepancy between philosophy and practice.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Research is playing an increasingly important role in marketing and distributive education. With increased dissemination and application of research results, decision making in marketing and distributive education should become much more objective and effective. Dissemination of research results is critical but difficult, particularly as the quantity of research increases.

given to broadening the outlets for dissemination.
and briefs that stress major findings and
ons should be widely disseminated. Monographs
iled analysis of relevant research on a
ssue should be prepared. The marketing and
ion profession should consider the development
of relevant research or some other method of
sifying research on a continuing basis. Future
and Synthesis of Research in Marketing and
ion should be published on a regular basis.
xt edition should begin immediately to aid in
a comprehensive publication.

ned in marketing and distributive education,
iven to the potential usefulness of the
ns and designs should be selected to
and replicability of the study. Previous
within and outside of marketing and
ion should be carefully reviewed to provide for
istency of effort.

earch

base of research is developing in marketing and
ion, several areas are in need of specific
pics of human resource needs and employment
istration and supervision, and guidance and
iously been identified as receiving limited

t are of specific interest to the profession,
o research devoted to them include:

adult students and instruction devoted
and retraining marketing personnel.

special needs populations in marketing and

l research evaluating alternative
al models and strategies.

f teacher education, program models, inservice
and preparation of teachers using
nal strategies.

ion of marketing and distributive education
tive human resource development system.

6. The development and testing of nontraditioanl program strategies both inside and outside the public educational system.

7. The development of transportable research models that can be easily implemented at state and local levels.

A need exists in marketing and distributive education to critically analyze past research and to develop a comprehensive, specific plan for future research. As questions and issues are identified within the profession, a framework should be available to promote careful study and the search for answers to questions. Research coupled with dissemination and application will be a positive element in the future development of marketing and distributive education.

TABLE 1

DOCTOR'S AND OTHER STUDIES IN MARKETING AND DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION

1968-1980

Year	68*	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79**	80**	Total
Doctor's Studies	4	9	10	11	11	10	13	12	19	25	13	10	1	148
Other Studies	1	2	3	4	2	5	5	13	13	12	13	7	0	80
Total	5	11	13	15	13	15	18	25	32	37	26	17	1	228

* Does not include the studies reported by Ashmun and Larson for 1968.

** Only those studies reported to the authors for 1979 and 1980 are included. A comprehensive search was conducted for the years, 1969-1978.

TABLE II

REFERENCES MADE TO STUDIES REPORTED BY YEARS AND SUBJECTS

Subject Area	68*	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79**	80**	Total
I. Philosophy and Objectives														
Dissertations		1		1	1	2	2	1	1	3	2	1		15
Others								1						1
Total	0	1	0	1	1	2	2	2	1	3	2	1	0	16 (6.6%)
II. Human Resource Needs and Employment Opportunities														
Dissertations				1										1
Others		1					1			1	1			4
Total	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	5 (2.1%)
III. Learner Characteristics														
Dissertations	1			1	1		1	1		1				6
Others				1				1		1				3
Total	1	0	0	2	1	0	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	9 (3.7%)
IV. Curriculum														
Dissertations	1	2	2	1	2	2	1		1	3	3	2		20
Others			1	1					7	5	2	1	1	18
Total	1	3	3	1	2	2	1	7	6	5	4	3	0	38 (15.6%)
V. Program Design Models														
Dissertations			1		1									2
Others						1			1	1	1			4
Total	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	6 (2.4%)

TABLE II, con't.

Subject Area	68*	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79**	80**	Total
VI. Instruction														
Dissertations	2	4	2	1	2	1	3	2	7	6	6	2	1	39
Others				2	1	1	3	3	6	2	4	4		26
Total	2	4	2	3	3	2	6	5	13	8	10	6	1	65 (26.8%)
VII. Guidance and Counseling														
Dissertations					1				1	1				3
Others								1						1
Total	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	4 (1.7%)
VIII. Teacher Education														
Dissertations			4	3	2	2	3	4	6	10		3		37
Others		1	1	1	1			2	1	3	1	3		14
Total	0	1	5	4	3	2	3	6	7	13	1	6	0	51 (21.0%)
IX. Administration and Supervision														
Dissertations							1		1			1		3
Others					1			1			1			3
Total	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	6 (2.4%)
X. Evaluation														
Dissertations		2	1	4	1	3	4	5	3	3	1	2		29
Others	1	2	1		1	2	1	2	1	2	1			14
Total	1	4	2	4	2	5	5	7	4	5	2	2		43 (17.7%)
TOTAL BY YEAR														
Dissertations	4	9	10	12	11	10	15	13	20	27	12	11	1	155
Others	1	5	3	4	4	4	5	18	14	12	10	8	0	88
TOTAL	5	14	13	16	15	14	20	31	34	39	22	19	1	243 (100%)

* Does not include the studies reported by Ashmun and Larson for 1968.

** Only those studies reported to the authors for 1979 and 1980 are included. A comprehensive search was conducted for the years 1969-1978.

TABLE III

FREQUENCY WITHIN AREAS OF RESEARCH

	Area of Research	Number of Studies	Percent
1.	Instruction	65	26.8
2.	Teacher Education	51	21.0
3.	Evaluation	43	17.7
4.	Curriculum	38	15.6
5.	Philosophy and Objectives	16	6.6
6.	Learner Characteristics	9	3.7
7.	Program Design Models	6	2.4
8.	Human Resource Needs and Employment Opportunities	5	2.1
9.	Administration and Supervision	6	2.4
10.	Guidance and Counseling	4	1.7
	TOTAL	243	100.0%

REFERENCES

PHILOSOPHY AND OBJECTIVES

Bradley, D., III. *Identifying, Validating, and Selecting Objectives for Postsecondary Distributive Education.* Ed.D. dissertation, Columbia: University of Missouri, 1978.

Callahan, R. *The Identification of Goals for the Junior Collegiate Division of the Distributive Education Clubs of America.* Ed.D. dissertation, Auburn, Alabama: Auburn University, 1979.

Christianson, L. *Identification, Refinement, and Rankings of Goals and Objectives for the National Association of Distributive Education Teachers.* Ed.D. dissertation, Grand Forks: University of North Dakota, 1977.

Corbin, S. *Formulation of Goals and Objectives for the High School Division of Distributive Education Clubs of America.* Ed.D. dissertation, Blacksburg: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1976.

Crawford, L. *A Philosophy of Distributive Education: A Report of the First Step in the Research Project to Identify a Competency Pattern Approach to Curriculum Construction in Distributive Teacher Education.* Blacksburg: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1967. (ED 019 412)

_____. *A Philosophy of Distributive Education.* Blacksburg: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1975.

Davis, R. *The Extent to Which Indiana Distributive Education Programs are Achieving Program Philosophy as Perceived by Students and Teacher-Coordinators.* Ed.D. dissertation, Tempe: Arizona State University, 1977.

Decker, R. *Aims, Objectives, and Need for Distributive Education in Arizona.* Ed.D. dissertation, Tempe: Arizona State University, 1977.

Doonan, T. *A Philosophy of Distributive Education - 1974. A Comparison of Philosophies Held by Leaders in 1965 with Those in 1974.* Ph.D. dissertation, E. Lansing: Michigan State University, 1975.

Ertel, K. *Clusters of Tasks Performed by Merchandising Employees Working in Three SICs of Retail Establishments. Final Report No. 20.* Moscow: Idaho University, 1968. (ED 023 911)

Furtado, L. *An Interpretive History of Distributive Education, 1936-1972, as Seen by Selected National Leaders.* Ph.D. dissertation, E. Lansing: Michigan State University, 1973.

Harris, E. *Evaluative Criteria and Standards for Distributive Education on the Secondary Level*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University, 1978.

Houstman, J. *The Future of Vocational Office and Distributive Education as Perceived by State Supervisors and Teacher Educators*. Ed.D. dissertation, Tempe: Arizona State University, 1972.

Kinzer, L. *The Philosophy of Distributive Education Teacher Coordinators as Compared to Business and Office Education Teacher Coordinators in New Mexico*. Ed.D. dissertation, Tempe: Arizona State University, 1969.

Little, M. *Objectives and Evaluative Criteria for Distributive Education Programs at the Secondary Level in Michigan*. Ph.D. dissertation, E. Lansing: Michigan State University, 1978.

Lynch, R. and Kohns, D. *Proposed Design and Broad Content Outlines for Teacher and Professional Educator Materials in the Field of Marketing and Distribution*. Blacksburg: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1977.

National Study of Secondary School Evaluation. *Evaluative Criteria for the Evaluation of Secondary Schools.* Washington, D.C: American Council on Education, 1969.

Reece, B. *Adult Distributive Education Issues in 1970.* Ed.D. dissertation, Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1971.

Ricci, F. *The Nature of Retail Education with Implications for Curricular Development for Postsecondary Institutions in New England.* Ed.D. dissertation, Boston, Massachusetts: Boston University, 1972.

Shoemaker, P. *Current Issues in Adult Distributive Education in Ohio*. Ph.D. dissertation, Athens: The University of Ohio, 1973.

Strydesky, R. *The Validation of Evaluative Standards and Criteria for Distributive Teacher Education Through Use of the Delphi Technique*. Ph.D. dissertation, College Park: University of Maryland, 1977.

Torres, J. *Business and Distributive Education in the Public Secondary Schools of Puerto Rico: An Historical Study of the Period 1898-1972.* Ph.D. dissertation, New York: New York University, 1979.

Weatherford, J. *Identification and Analysis of Issues in Distributive Education*. Ph.D. dissertation, Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1972.

Whitted, M. *Criteria for the Evaluation of Two-Year Federally Reimbursed Distributive Education Programs in the Junior College*. Ed.D. dissertation, Bloomington: Indiana University, 1969.

HUMAN RESOURCE NEEDS AND EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Devitt, M. and Leonard, K. *Identification and Analysis of Distributive Education Curricular Needs by Job Title.* Indianapolis, Indiana: State Board of Vocational and Technical Education, 1977.

Eggland, S. *The Development of a Hierarchy of Need for Specialized Distributive Education Programs in Postsecondary Schools in Nebraska.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1974. (ED 105 201)

Gildan, K. *Development of an Instructional Program to Prepare Distributive Education Teacher Coordinators to Teach the Educable Mentally Handicapped*. Boca Raton: Florida Atlantic University, 1977.

Patton, L. *An Analysis of Curriculum and Employment Needs in Postsecondary Distributive Education Programs in Oklahoma*. Ed.D. dissertation, Stillwater: Oklahoma State University, 1971.

Samson, H. *The Nature and Characteristics of Middle Management in Retail Department Stores.* Madison: The University of Wisconsin, School of Education, 1969. (ED 051 394)

LEARNER CHARACTERISTICS

Allen, T. *A Comparison of Distributive Education Majors in Terminal Programs with Other Curriculum Majors in Transfer Programs on Selected Variables.* Ed.D. dissertation, Athens: University of Georgia, 1971.

Boucher, H. *Job Satisfaction and Expectations of Distributive Education Graduates.* Ph.D. dissertation, Manhattan: Kansas State University, 1977.

Crawford, L. *A Philosophy of Distributive Education.* Blacksburg: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1975.

Gildan, K. *Development of an Instruction Program to Prepare Distributive Education Teacher-Coordinators to Teach the Educable Mentally Handicapped.* Boca Raton: Florida Atlantic University, Florida State Department of Education, 1977.

Harris, E. *Employer Preferences and Teacher-Coordinator Practices in Distributive Education.* DeKalb: Northern Illinois University, 1971. (ED 049 392)

Hoffman, K. *Development of an Instrument to Assess the Composite Subject Matter Achievement of Secondary Cooperative Distributive Education Students in Ohio.* Ph.D. dissertation, Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1968.

Lundell, W. *The Relationships of Selected Characteristics and Program Experiences of 1968 Minnesota Distributive Education High School Graduates to their Post High School Occupational and Educational Status Five Years Later.* Ph.D. dissertation, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1975.

Moores, E. *The Development of a Multi-Variate Formula to Predict Occupational Work Experience Success of Distributive Education Students.* Ed.D dissertation, College Park: University of Maryland, 1974.

Senning, W. *Factors Contributing to the Enrollment of Disadvantaged (Especially Black) in Junior College Marketing and Related Management Programs.* Ed.D. dissertation, Boca Raton: Florida Atlantic University, 1972.

Sita, M. *Relationships Between Perceived Program Adequacy and Personal, Educational, and Occupational Characteristics of Adult Distributive Education Students in Community Colleges of Arizona.* Ph.D. dissertation, Tempe: Arizona State University, 1974.

CURRICULUM

Ball, H. A Congruency Study of the Training Needs of Middle Management in Department Stores as Perceived by Postsecondary Marketing Educators and Businessmen in the Department Store Industry. Ph.D. dissertation, Madison: The University of Wisconsin, 1970.

Berger, D. and Lokai, L. An Analysis of the Agricultural Supply Business and Services Occupation. Columbus: The Ohio State University, Trade and Industrial Education Instructional Laboratory, 1976. (ED 151 526)

Bohac, R. and Vernon, R. An Analysis of the Automobile Sales Occupation. Columbus: The Ohio State University, Trade and Industrial Education Instructional Laboratory, 1975. (ED 107 951)

Brown, K. Distributive Education in the High School. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1963.

Carmichael, J. An Analysis of Activities of Middle Management Personnel in the Retail Trades Industry with Implications for Curriculum Development in Postsecondary Institutions. Ph.D. dissertation, E. Lansing: Michigan State University, 1968.

Christ, C. and Deluzin, J. An Analysis of the Auto Parts Counterperson Occupation. Columbus: The Ohio State University, Trade and Industrial Education Instructional Laboratory, 1975. (ED 107 950)

Cook, F. et al. Senior Year Intensified Demonstration Curriculum Program. Detroit: Wayne State University, Department of Business and Distributive Education, 1970. (ED 040 297)

Crawford, L. A Competency Pattern Approach to Curriculum Construction in Distributive Teacher Education. Blacksburg: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1967. (ED 032 383)

Devitt, M. and Leonard, K. Identification and Analysis of Distributive Education Curricular Needs by Job Title. Indianapolis, Indiana: State Board of Vocational and Technical Education, 1977.

Dietrich, L. Competency Patterns in Selected Distributive/Marketing Jobs in Florida's Tourism-related Industries as a Basis for Educational Planning. Ed.D dissertation, Boca Raton: Florida Atlantic University, 1976.

Edwards, T. et al. *An Empirical Determination of Tasks Essential to Successful Performance as a Retail Landscape and Garden Store Salesman.* Columbus: The Ohio State University, Department of Agricultural Education, 1975. (ED 115 793)

Eggland, S. *The Determination and Verification of Economic Competencies Required of Persons Employed in Distributive Occupations.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska, Department of Business Education, 1976.

Ely, V. *The Distributive Education Program.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1978. (ED 160 827)

Ertel, K. *Identification of Major Tasks Performed by Merchandising Employers Working in Three Standard Industrial Classifications of Retail Establishments.* Moscow: University of Idaho, 1966. (ED 010 657)

Fishco, R. *A Comparison of the Training Needs of Potential Mid-Management Retail Executives as Perceived by Retail Presidents or Vice Presidents and Retail Employment Executives of Retail Department Stores.* Edison, New Jersey: Middlesex County College, 1976.

Gildan, K. *Development of an Instructional Program to Prepare Distributive Education Teacher Coordinators to Teach the Educable Mentally Handicapped.* Boca Raton: Florida Atlantic University, 1977.

Golden, E. *An Analysis of Marketing Competencies Needed in Agribusiness for the Determination of Middle Level Management Curriculum Models.* Ed.D. dissertation, DeKalb: Northern Illinois University, 1970.

Harestad, C. et al. *An Analysis of the Real Estate Occupation.* Columbus: The Ohio State University, Trade and Industrial Education Instructional Laboratory, 1975. (ED 107 978)

Harris, E. *Curriculum Research for the Development of Marketing and Distributive Education Curriculum Guides in the State of Illinois.* DeKalb: Northern Illinois University, 1978.

_____. *Evaluative Criteria and Standards for Distributive Education on the Secondary Level.* DeKalb: Northern Illinois University, 1978.

Harrison, W., Jr. "Learning Activity Packages: A Progress Report." *DE Today.* 7(February, 1973): 2

Levere, W. A Study of Distributive Education Students' Perceptions and Attitudes Toward Secondary Distributive Education Teachers in Utah. Ed.D. dissertation, Logan: Utah State University, 1976.

Litchfield, C. and Smith, W. A National Study of Occupational Experience Certification Requirements for Distributive Education Teacher-Coordinators and of Directed Occupational-Experience Opportunities Provided Through Distributive Teacher Education Programs. Blacksburg: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1977.

Little, W. Relationships Between Certain Personality Characteristics of Postsecondary Distributive Education Personnel and Job Satisfaction. Ph.D. dissertation, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1972.

Lucas, S. and Weber, L. The Improvement of Evaluation Procedures of Teachers of Distribution and Marketing. Skokie, Illinois: Sears, Roebuck Foundation; Richmond: Virginia State Department of Education, 1970. (ED 047 130)

Mayleben, D. Four Broad Components of Personality as It Relates to the Perceived Effectiveness of the Distributive Education Student-Teachers and Their Students in Minnesota. Ph.D dissertation, E. Lansing: Michigan State University, 1973.

Miller, J. A Factor Analysis of Professional Education Competencies and Selected Community College Instructors. Ph.D. dissertation, Corvallis: Oregon State University, 1971.

Olsen, R. A Study of the Occupational Experience of Distributive Education Teacher Coordinators and Its Relationship to Businessmen Ratings of Programs, Student Competencies, and Ratings from the Results of Follow-Up Studies on Graduates. Ed.D. dissertation, Moscow: University of Idaho, 1971.

Parker, R. Evaluation of the Effectiveness of LAPs as Part of the Distributive Education Curriculum in Tennessee. Ed.D. dissertation, Knoxville: The University of Tennessee, 1979.

Renshaw, P. Basic Marketing and Marketing Related Knowledges for Secondary School Distributive Education Instructional Personnel. Ph.D. dissertation, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1976.

Riley, E. An Experimental Comparison of the Effects of Three Methods of Conducting Visitation Conferences in Cooperative Distributive Education Programs. Ed.D. dissertation, Columbia: University of Missouri, 1970.

Hogan, D. Economic Understandings Needed by Secondary School Distributive Education Teachers. Ph.D dissertation, Tempe: Arizona State University, 1977.

_____. Implementation of Vocational Education in Distribution. Report of a USOE Clinic. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, School of Education, 1978.

Jacobs, B. A Study to Identify a Competency Pattern for the Manufacturer's Salesperson. Ph.D. dissertation, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1978.

James, R. Competencies for the Most Common First-Level Marketing Positions in Food Marketing, General Retail Merchandising, and Wholesaling. Ed.D. dissertation, DeKalb: Northern Illinois University, 1978.

Kirk, H. Educational Needs for Mid-Management Personnel in Florida with Implications for Curricular Development. Ed.D. dissertation, Boca Raton: Florida Atlantic University, 1969.

Kitzmiller, C. et al. An Analysis of the Industrial Sales Occupation. Columbus: The Ohio State University, Trade and Industrial Education Instructional Laboratory, 1973. (ED 107 965)

LaSalle, K. Retail Education: A Process-Centered Cooperative Education Curriculum for Massachusetts Community Colleges. Ed.D dissertation, Boston, Massachusetts: Boston University, 1973.

Leventhal, J. A Study of Curriculum of Selected Two-Year Postsecondary Marketing and Distribution Programs. Ed.D. dissertation, Buffalo: State University of New York, 1970.

Lynch, R. and Kohns, D. Proposed Design and Broad Content Outlines for Teacher and Professional Educator Materials in the Field of Marketing and Distribution. Blacksburg: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1977.

Malina, V. MODELS (Modern Office and Distributive Education Learning Systems). A Systematic Analysis of Selected Jobs in the Hotel Industry. Ph.D. dissertation, Los Angeles: University of California, 1978.

McAnelly, J. A Study of the Mathematical Competencies Considered Important by Supervisors in Large Retail Firms in the Metropolitan Area of Chicago. Ed.D. dissertation, DeKalb: Northern Illinois University, 1977.

Miller, M. Critical Requirements for the Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Employed in Retail Jobs in Columbus, Ohio. Ph.D. dissertation, Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1969.

Moore, G. et al. An Analysis of the Insurance Sales Occupation. Columbus: The Ohio State University, Trade and Industrial Education Instructional Laboratory, 1975. (ED 107 966)

Palmore, T. A Study of Selling Competencies and Their Priorities for Inclusion in the Distributive Education Curriculum. Ph.D. dissertation, Albuquerque: University of New Mexico, 1972.

Patterson, J. The Determination of Competencies in the Hotel-Motel Industry with Implications for Curriculum Development for Post-Secondary Distributive Education Cooperative Students in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Ed.D dissertation, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Temple University, 1974.

Patton, L. An Analysis of Curriculum and Employment Needs in Post-Secondary Distributive Education Programs in Oklahoma. Ed.D dissertation, Stillwater: Oklahoma State University, 1971.

Pope, B. Development of a Data Base for Curriculum Development in Distribution and Marketing. Richardson, Texas: EPD Consortium D., 1976.

Ricci, R. The Nature of Retail Education with Implications for Curriculum Development for Postsecondary Institutions in New England. Ph.D. dissertation, Boston, Massachusetts: Boston University, 1972.

Samson, H. The Nature and Characteristics of Middle Management in Retail Department Stores. Madison: The University of Wisconsin, School of Education, 1969. (ED 051 394)

_____ and Rathert, M. A Survey of the Importance of Basic Marketing Concepts and the Extent of Their Coverage in the IDECC System. Madison: The University of Wisconsin, 1976.

Sedlik, D. Marketing Research Competencies Needed by Middle-Level Management in Selected Fields of Distribution in the State of Illinois. Ed.D. dissertation, DeKalb: Northern Illinois University, 1973.

Shell, V. Computational Concepts and Tasks Associated with Entry Level General Merchandising Employees in the Columbus, OH; Louisville, KY; and Nashville, TN Areas. Ph.D. dissertation, Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1979.

Vocational-Technical Education Consortium of States. Fourth Progress and Information Report. Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 1977. (ED 154 109)

Weber, J. The Development and Testing of Career Education Curriculum Materials in Selected Distributive Occupations for the Motivation Program Students of the School District of Philadelphia. Ed.D. dissertation, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Temple University, 1979.

Williams, T. et al. Task Validation of 16 General Merchandising Department Store Occupations. Washington, D.C.: USOE, 1979.

Yoder, E. and McCracken, J. An Empirical Determination of Tasks Essential to Successful Performance as an Agricultural-Industrial Equipment Dealership Partsman. Determination of a Common Core of Basic Skills in Agribusiness and Natural Resources. Columbus: The Ohio State University, Department of Agricultural Education Research Foundation, 1975. (ED 115 813)

PROGRAM DESIGN MODELS

Allen, T. An Evaluation of the Implementation of the On-the-Job Non-Pay Training Concept in Secondary Cooperative Vocational Educational Programs in West Virginia. Huntington, West Virginia: Marshall University, Graduate School, 1977.

Basseri, J. A Design for Cooperative Merchandising Mid-Management Training in the California Public Community College. Ph.D. dissertation, Los Angeles: University of California, 1970.

Crawford, L. Developing and Testing Simulated Occupational Experiences for Distributive Education Students in Rural Communities. Blacksburg: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1976. (ED 118 997)

Elias, J. and Reece, B. Development of a Model for Distributive Education in Area Vocational Schools in Missouri. Columbia: University of Missouri, Missouri State Department of Education, 1978. (ED 166 371)

Lancaster, R. A Facilities Model for Laboratory Experiences in Junior College Distributive Education. Ed.D. dissertation, Gainesville: The University of Florida, 1972.

Shapiro, W. *Education for Living: A Model Distributive Education Program.* Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Dorrance and Company, 1973. (ED 095 299)

INSTRUCTION

Allen, T. *An Evaluation of the Implementation of the IDECC LAPS Program in Secondary Cooperative Vocational Education Programs in West Virginia.* Huntington, West Virginia: Marshall University, Graduate School, 1976.

Ammerman, H. and Essex, D. *Performance Content for Job Training.* Columbus: The Ohio State University, The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1977. (ED 146 370)

Ammerman, H. and Pratzner, F. *Performance Content for Job Training: Introduction.* Columbus: The Ohio State University, The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1977. (ED 146 369)

Anderton, M. *The Relationship Between Selected Variables and the Attitudes of Distributive Education Coordinators Toward IDECC Learning Activity Packages.* Ph.D. dissertation, Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1976.

Bailey, W. *The Effect of Leadership Training on the Attitudes of Student Officers in the Distributive Education Clubs of America.* Ed.D. dissertation, Auburn, Alabama: Auburn University, 1979.

Banister, T. *Evaluation of Facilities, Equipment, and Instructional Resources in Distributive Education Programs in Arkansas.* Ed.D. dissertation, Fayetteville: University of Arkansas, 1969.

Berkowitz, A. *Part-Time Versus Alternate-Week Work Schedules As An Influence on the Educational Progress and Attitudes of Cooperative Vocational Distributive Education Students.* Ed.D. dissertation, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Temple University, 1974.

Berns, R. *Attitudes of Secondary Distributive Education Teacher-Coordinators and Students Toward Selected Teaching Techniques Using the Semantic Differential.* Ph.D. dissertation, Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1978.

_____ and Smith, C. *A Competency-Based Inservice Training Program for Distributive Education Coordinators on Their Role as DECA Chapter Advisors.* Blacksburg: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Virginia State Department of Education, 1979. (ED 171 996)

Blackwell, J. *A Descriptive Study of Alabama Teacher-Coordinators Reactions to the Implementation of the Competency-Based Curriculum in Distributive Education*. Ed.D. dissertation, Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama, 1978.

Boulware, G. *An Analysis of the Mathematical Skill Learning Activity Packages Developed by the Interstate Distributive Education Curriculum Consortium*. Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia: University of South Carolina, 1976.

Callahan, R. *The Identification of Goals for the Junior Collegiate Division of the Distributive Education Clubs of America*. Ed.D. dissertation, Auburn, Alabama: Auburn University, 1979.

Casterline, L. *Effects of Training Plans on the Perceptions of Distributive Education as a Training Program*. Ph.D. dissertation, Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1974.

Clark, A. *An Analysis of Leadership and Self-Confidence and/or Self-Acceptance Outcomes from Student Participation in Distributive Education Clubs of America*. Ph.D. dissertation, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1978.

Connell, W. *The Relationship of DECA Membership and Career Maturity*. Ed.D. dissertation, New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers - The State University, 1977.

Corbin, S. *Formulation of Goals and Objectives for the High School Division of the Distributive Education Clubs of America*. Ed.D. dissertation, Blacksburg: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1975.

Crawford, L. *A Competency Pattern Approach to Curriculum Construction in Distributive Teacher Education*. Blacksburg: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1967. (ED 032 383)

_____. *A Philosophy of Distributive Education*. Blacksburg: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1975.

_____. *Developing and Testing Simulated Occupational Experiences for Distributive Education Students in Rural Communities*. Blacksburg: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1976. (ED 118 997)

Cunningham, W. *A Comparison of the IDECC Learning Activity Packages with a Conventional Presentation in Distributive Education*. Ed.D. dissertation, Knoxville: University of Tennessee, 1976.

Cushman, R. *The Relationship Between Selected Characteristics of Secondary Distributive Education Programs and Initial Job Employment or College Entrance*. Ed.D. dissertation, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Temple University, 1973.

Dailey, R. "A Profile of DECA and Perceptions Concerning Functional and Operational Beliefs." *CDTE Bulletin 30*. 1977.

Distributive Education Clubs of America. *Evaluation of the DECA National Competency-Based Competitive Events*. Reston, Virginia: 1976, 1977, 1978.

Ditzenberger, R. *Perceived Barriers to Implementing a Distributive Education Competency-Based Learning System*. Ph.D. dissertation, Ames: Iowa State University, 1976.

_____. *DECA Competency-Based Written Event Evaluations*. Reston, Virginia: DECA, 1977, 1978, 1979.

Doneth, J. *Teaching Beliefs and Classroom Methodology of Selected Project and Cooperative Plan Distributive Education Teacher-Coordinators*. Ed.D. dissertation, DeKalb: Northern Illinois University, 1969.

Edutek, Inc. *An Evaluation of the New Competitive Events Designed for the Distributive Education Clubs of America's National Career Development Conference*. Lincoln, Nebraska, 1975.

Eggland, S. and Lynch, R. *A Process Evaluation of the New Competitive Events at the Distributive Education Clubs of America Mini-Conference*. Reston, Virginia: DECA, 1974.

Garblik, I. *Development of a Transparency Program for Teaching of Introductory Textiles, in Selected Areas of Distributive Education*. Ed.D. dissertation, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Temple University, 1972.

Gleason, J. *The Relationship of Sex and Selected Distributive Education Program Variables with Entry into Distributive Occupations After High School Graduation.* Ph.D. dissertation, Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1979.

Glendale Union High School District 205. *A Classroom Training Conference for Youth Leaders of Distributive Education in Arizona Vocational Education.* Glendale: Arizona Occupational Research Coordinating Unit, 1975. (ED 112 206)

Golabek, D. *An Investigation to Determine the Relative Effectiveness of the Consumer Game in Distributive Education Classes at the Secondary Level*. Ed.D. dissertation, New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers - The State University, 1973.

Harris, E. Employer Preferences and Teacher-Coordinator Practices in Distributive Education. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University, 1971. (ED 049 392)

Holt, D. Perceptions of Students, Teacher-Coordinators, and Training Station Employers Regarding the Effectiveness of Distributive Education Clubs of America. Ed.D. dissertation, Commerce: East Texas State University, 1978.

Holup, J., Jr. A Semantic Differential Study of the Connotative Meaning of Thirty Distributive Education Concepts. Ph.D. dissertation, Pullman: Washington State University, 1980.

Hutt, R. Perceptions of Employers Regarding Cooperative Distributive Education Programs at the Secondary Level. Ph.D. dissertation, E. Lansing: Michigan State University, 1975.

Kozma, J. An Analysis of Job Training Stations in Cooperative Distributive Education Programs in Florida Community College - Fall Semester 1978. Ed.D. dissertation, Boca Raton: Florida Atlantic University, 1978.

Lancaster, R. A Facilities Model for Laboratory Experiences in Junior College Distributive Education. Ed.D. dissertation, Gainesville: The University of Florida, 1972.

Litchford, C. A Case Study of Training Sponsor Perceptions Regarding the Coordination Phase of Secondary Cooperative-Plan Distributive Education Programs in Roanoke City and County, Virginia. Ed.D. dissertation, Blacksburg: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1977.

Lynch, R. and White, T. Training Plans for High School Cooperative Education Programs: A Developmental Project. Bloomington: Indiana University, Indiana Department of Public Instruction, Division of Vocational Education, 1971.

Maglio, J. Survey of the Interstate Distributive Education Curriculum as Utilized by Wisconsin High School Distributive Education Teacher-Coordinators. Masters thesis, Menomonie: University of Wisconsin-Stout, 1978.

McComas, M. A Study of the Regional Development of the Distributive Education Clubs of America in the Southern and North Atlantic Regions. Ed.D. dissertation, Auburn, Alabama: Auburn University, 1978.

McLean, G. Attitudes of Minnesota Office and Distributive Education Coordinators Toward Vocational Student Organizations. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Delta Pi Epsilon, Phi Chapter, 1973. (ED 085 568)

Mead, M. et al. Performance Content for Job Training: Processing Survey Data: Technical Appendices. Columbus: The Ohio State University, The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1977. (ED 146 373)

Morgan, D. A Comparison Study of the Cooperative Distributive Education Student and Training Station Supervisor for Improved Placement Methods. Ed.D. dissertation, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Temple University, 1977.

Park, N. An Assessment of the Attitude of Distributive Education Students and Teacher-Coordinators Toward Learning Activity Packages in Wisconsin and Indiana Secondary Schools. Ed.D. dissertation, Knoxville: The University of Tennessee, 1975.

Parker, R. Evaluation of the Effectiveness of LAPS as Part of the Distributive Education Curriculum in Tennessee. Ed.D. dissertation, Knoxville: The University of Tennessee, 1979.

Patton, J. An Appraisal of the Effectiveness of the Pilot Merit Awards Program in Distributive Education. Ed.D. dissertation, Knoxville: The University of Tennessee, 1971.

Ramey, R. A Comparison of an Individualized System of Instruction and Conventional Group Instruction in Distributive Education. Ph.D. dissertation, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: University of Pittsburgh, 1976.

Righthand, H. A Followup Study of Connecticut Distributive Education Graduates of the Classes of 1965-1968-1971. Hartford: Connecticut State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, 1977. (ED 141 369)

Riley, C. "Evaluation of DECA Inservice Education." Forum. 28(April, 1974): 19-21.

Roberson, R. Distributive Education Curriculum, Methods, and Materials Project. Whitewater: University of Wisconsin, 1979.

Rossi, A. A Comparative Investigation of Attitudes and Opinions of Teacher-Coordinators and Principals Regarding Selected Areas of the New Jersey Distributive Education Program. Ed.D. dissertation, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Temple University, 1974.

Rowe, K. Development of Selected Marketing Competencies Through Utilization of Two Methods of Teaching in the Secondary School. Ph.D. dissertation, E. Lansing: Michigan State University, 1969.

Smith, D. A Study to Determine the Methods and Materials Used to Prepare Students for Competition in the 1979 Texas Distributive Education Clubs of America High School Division Career Development Conference. San Angelo, Texas: Angelo State University, Faculty Research Grant, 1979.

Smith, G. Unit Achievement Tests in Distributive Education. Ph.D. dissertation, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1969.

_____. An Experimental Study Utilizing A Prototype Instructional System for Teaching Interpersonal Relation Concepts in Salesmanship. Ed.D. dissertation, Moscow: University of Idaho, 1970.

Snyder, R. Effectiveness of Employability-Skill Instruction on Achievement by Michigan Secondary Distributive Education Students. Ph.D. dissertation, E. Lansing: Michigan State University, 1978.

Stapleton, C. A Computer-Assisted, Competency-Based Informational System Designed to Describe Student Distributive Occupational Proficiency Levels. Ed.D. dissertation, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1977.

Sternberg, A. A Study of Selected Values and Attitudes of New Jersey DE Students Who Are Members of DECA As Compared to New Jersey DE Students Who Are Not Members of DECA. Ed.D. dissertation, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Temple University, 1976.

Strate, J. A Comparative Benefit-Cost Study of One-Year Distributive Education and Two-Year Distributive Education Secondary Programs in Missouri. Ed.D. dissertation, Columbia: University of Missouri, 1974.

_____ and Brorson, B. A Model Distributive Education Competency Based Learning Laboratory. Grand Forks: University of North Dakota, 1976. (ED 131 329)

Stroh, T. Video Tape Feedback in the Development of Listening Skills by Industrial Salesmen. Ed.D. dissertation, New York, New York: Columbia University, 1968.

Thrash, J. The Project Method in Distributive Education: Student Achievement in Selected Content Areas. Ed.D. dissertation, Stillwater: Oklahoma State University, 1970.

Weber, L. An Evaluation Design for Field Testing Learning Activity Packages. Paper presented in New Orleans, Louisiana, 1972.

_____ et al. The Evaluation of Learning Activity Packages Developed by the Interstate Distributive Education Curriculum Consortium. Paper presented at the annual conference of the AERA, Chicago, Illinois, 1974. (ED 098 261)

_____. A Report on the Nature of the Use of Learning Activity Packages in Distributive Education Programs and the Determination of Change Orientation on Distributive Education Teachers. Paper presented at the AERA conference, San Francisco, California, 1976. (ED 126 347)

Williams, T. Identification of Performance Tasks for Distributive Education Teacher-Coordinators Who Utilize the IDECC System. Ph.D. dissertation. Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1977.

_____ and Berns, R. Experimentation and Further Validation of the IDECC Competency Based Teaching Approach in Adult Education. Columbus: The Ohio State University, IDECC, Inc., 1978.

_____ and Heath-Sipos, B. Experimentation and Further Validation of the IDECC Competency Based Teaching Approach in Postsecondary Education. Columbus: The Ohio State University, IDECC, Inc., 1978.

Wisconsin State Board of Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education. An Assessment of Current and Projected Individualized Instruction in Business and Marketing Courses Provided by the Districts of the Wisconsin Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education System. Final Report. Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1971. (ED 066 586)

GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING

Barger, B. A Study to Determine the Effectiveness of a Career Development Program in Distributive Education. Ed.D. dissertation, Knoxville: University of Tennessee, 1976.

Braverman, B. The Implementation and Evaluation of a Formalized Recruitment Program for Distributive Education. Ed.D. dissertation, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Temple University, 1972.

Crawford, L. A Philosophy of Distributive Education. Blacksburg: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1975.

Husted, S. Perceptions of Secondary National Association of Distributive Education Teachers (NADET) Regarding Their Role in Guidance and Counseling. Ph.D. dissertation, E. Lansing: Michigan State University, 1977.

TEACHER EDUCATION

Allen, T. and Stoneman, J. Activities Performed by Teacher-Coordinators of Distributive Education Beyond the Regular Day. Boone, North Carolina: Appalachian State University, Staff Study, 1979.

Ashmun, R. et al. Occupational Experience and Career Development Training for Distributive Educators and Vocational Counselors. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1969. (ED 036 649)

Berns, R. An Evaluation of the Undergraduate Distributive Education Program at VPI&SU. Blacksburg: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, College of Education, 1979.

_____ and Smith, C. A Competency-Based Inservice Training Program for Distributive Education Coordinators on Their Role as DECA Chapter Advisors. Blacksburg: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Virginia State Department of Education, 1979. (ED 171 996)

Brownlee, R. Analysis of Opinions of Secondary Cooperative Distributive Education Teacher-Coordinators in Mississippi Toward Recommended Coordination Activities. Ed.D. dissertation, Blacksburg: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1977.

Buckner, L. and Gildan, K. Field Based Teacher Education and Curriculum Development for Pre-Vocational Distributive Education Teachers. Boca Raton: Florida Atlantic University, Department of Education, Division of Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education, 1975.

Burrow, J. The Purposes of and Competencies Developed Through Occupational Experience for Distributive Education Teachers. Ph.D. dissertation, Lincoln: The University of Nebraska, 1976.

Carter, K. An Evaluation of the Performance of Critical Tasks by Most Successful and Least Successful Cooperative Distributive Education Teachers. Ed.D. dissertation, Lexington: University of Kentucky, 1972.

Charters, M. Empirical Determination of Effectiveness of a Competency-Based Program in Distributive Education. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University, 1976. (ED 137 512)

Clous, C. A Comparative Analysis of Training Sponsor Reactions to Selected Coordinator Tasks Performed by DE Teacher-Coordinators in Ohio. Ph.D. dissertation, Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1976.

Cooley, C. *A Twenty-Year (1954-1974) Appraisal of the Master's Program in Business Education and Distributive Education at Northwestern State University of Louisiana.* Ed.D. dissertation, Natchitoches: Northwestern State University of Louisiana, 1975.

Cotrell, C. *Model Curricula for Vocational and Technical Teacher Education: Report No. II.* Columbus: The Ohio State University, The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1971. (ED 059 354)

Crawford, L. *A Competency Pattern Approach to Curriculum Construction in Distributive Teacher Education.* Blacksburg: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1967. (ED 032 383)

_____. *A Philosophy of Distributive Education.* Blacksburg: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1975.

Eggland, S. The Development and Evaluation of a Directed *Occupational Experience Program.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1978.

_____. *An Analysis of Student-Teacher Interaction in Distributive Education Classrooms.* Ph.D. dissertation, Madison: The University of Wisconsin, 1971.

Ferguson, E. *Vocational Teaching in Diverse Cultural Settings.* Columbus: The Ohio State University, The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1972. (ED 061 418)

Foust, S. *The Relationship Between Distributive Education Teacher Effectiveness and Selected Teacher Characteristics and the Competency Based Certification Examination.* Ph.D. dissertation, Atlanta: Georgia State University, 1979.

Gildan, K. *Development of an Instructional Program to Prepare Distributive Education Teacher Coordinators to Teach the Educable Mentally Handicapped.* Boca Raton: Florida Atlantic University, Florida State Department of Education, 1977.

Graziano, L. *The Identification and Validation of a List of Teaching Competencies Utilized by Distributive Education Teachers.* Ed.D. dissertation, Detroit, Michigan: Wayne State University, 1974.

Hansen, G. *The Role of the Distributive Education Teacher Coordinator as Perceived by Iowa Distributive Education Teacher Coordinators and Their Principals.* Ph.D. dissertation, College Station: Texas A & M University, 1975.

Harrington, F. Development of a Self-Instructional Package on Cooperative Education Coordination Skills. Ph.D. dissertation, Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1970.

Harris, E. Employer Preferences and Teacher-Coordinator Practices in Distributive Education. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University, 1971. (ED 049 392)

Heath-Sipos, B. Attitudes of Distributive Education Teachers Toward Their Undergraduate Preparation to Conduct a Distributive Education Program. Ph.D. dissertation, Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1979.

Hobbs, R. Selected Practices of Distributive Education Coordinators in Secondary Schools of the State of New York. Ph.D. dissertation, Bronx, New York: Fordham University, 1970.

Irwin, P. Identifying Competencies of Postsecondary Mid-Management Instructor-Coordinators by Comparing the Opinions and Perception of Selected Administrators and Mid-Management Instructor-Coordinators in Texas. Ed.D. dissertation, Denton: North Texas State University, 1977.

Isenburg, R. Professional Characteristics of Postsecondary Distributive Education Instructors in the Southeastern United States. Ed.D. dissertation, Knoxville: The University of Tennessee, 1977.

Kinnaird, J. A Study of the Summer Agenda of Distributive Education Coordinators in Arkansas. Ed.D. dissertation, Fayetteville: University of Arkansas, 1977.

Kirkley, J. Professional Development Competency Needs of South Carolina Distributive Education Teacher-Coordinators. Ed.D. dissertation, Blacksburg: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1977.

Kobe, J. An Analysis of Competencies Necessary for Adult Vocational Education Instructors Who Teach in Programs Reimbursed by the Minnesota State Department of Education. Ph.D. dissertation, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1977.

Kohns, D. An Analysis of Unconscious and Conscious Professional Development Needs of Minnesota Distributive Education Inservice Personnel. Ph.D. dissertation, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1975.

Ryan, D. A Study to Compare Coordination Practices Employed by Teacher Coordinators in Distributive Education in Oklahoma with Expected Coordination Practices. Ed.D. dissertation, Stillwater: Oklahoma State University, 1976.

Searle, A. Certification Guidelines for Distributive Education as Perceived by State Supervisors and Teacher Educators of Distributive Education. Ed.D. dissertation, Knoxville: The University of Tennessee, 1977.

Smith, D. Curricula Organizations and Content for the Preparation of Teacher-Coordinators of Cooperative Vocational Education Programs. Ph.D. dissertation, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1973.

Strate, J. and Brorson, B. A Model Distributive Education Competency Based Learning Laboratory. Grand Forks: University of North Dakota, 1976. (ED 131 329)

Strydesky, R. The Validation of Evaluative Standards and Criteria for Distributive Teacher Education Through the Use of the Delphi Technique. Ph.D. dissertation, College Park: University of Maryland, 1977.

Swenson, D. Personality Type as a Factor in Predicting Academic Achievement, Satisfaction, Success, and Group Membership of Business and Distributive Education Teacher Candidates. Ed.D. dissertation, Logan: Utah State University, 1976.

Turner, J. An Exploratory Study of Predictive Relationships Between Personality Characteristics of Teachers of Disadvantaged Students and Principals' Ratings of Teacher Effectiveness. Ed.D. dissertation, Blacksburg: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1974.

Vredenburg, D. Differences Between Effective and Ineffective Colorado and Wyoming Distributive Education Coordinators Based Upon Program, Coordination, and Curriculum. Ph.D. dissertation, Greeley: University of Northern Colorado, 1975.

Wallette, D. Criteria for Admission to Distributive Teacher Education Programs. Ed.D. dissertation, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1974.

Williams, T. Identification of Performance Tasks for Distributive Education Teacher-Coordinators Who Utilize the IDECC System. Ph.D. dissertation, Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1977.

Wray, R. The Perceived Roles and Program Content for Recruiting Prospective Distributive Education Teacher Coordinators in Region V. Ed.D. dissertation, Bloomington: Indiana University, 1970.

Zachrison, R. Adult Distributive Education Instructor Behavior and Effectiveness as Perceived by Students. Ph.D. dissertation, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1977.

ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION

Amos, J. A Study of the Perceptions of Oklahoma Distributive Education Coordinators Regarding Functions of Local Advisory Committees. Ed.D. dissertation, Stillwater: Oklahoma State University, 1974.

Biddle, J. NASSDE Survey of State Supervision Structure for Distributive Education. Indianapolis, Indiana: National Association of State Supervisors of Distributive Education, 1972.

Crawford, L. A Philosophy of Distributive Education. Blacksburg: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1975.

Daentzer, J. The Frequency and Significance of Tasks Performed by State Staff in Business and Distributive Education. Ph.D. dissertation, E. Lansing: Michigan State University, 1976.

Devitt, M. NASSDE 1978 Survey of State Supervision Structure for Distributive Education. Indianapolis, Indiana: National Association of State Supervisors of Distributive Education, 1978.

Smith, C. The Critical Tasks to be Performed by Department Heads of Secondary Distributive Education Programs in Virginia. Ed.D. dissertation, Blacksburg: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1979.

EVALUATION

Adames, R. The Current Status and Future Directions of Distributive Education in New Hampshire. Ed.D. dissertation, Amherst: University of Massachusetts, 1975.

_____. *A Model for the Evaluation of the Distributive Education Program in Arizona*. Tempe: Arizona State University, College of Business Administration, 1975.

Allen, T. and Tugman, R. *A Survey of DE Teachers and Students: Their Attitudes Toward Business and Their Knowledge About the American Economic System*. Boone, North Carolina: Appalachian State University, College of Business, 1978.

Banister, T. *Evaluation of Facilities, Equipment, and Instructional Resources in Distributive Education Programs in Arkansas*. Ed.D. dissertation, Fayetteville: University of Arkansas, 1969.

Bennett, J. *Disadvantaged and Non-Disadvantaged Urban High School Students' Perceptions of Work Within General Merchandise Retail Department Stores*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers - The State University, Graduate School of Education, 1971.

Boyer, G. and Smith, G. *Perceptions and Attitudes of Students, Business Personnel, and Private Citizens of Business, Government, Labor, and Other Selected Institutions in Utah*. Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University, 1977. (ED 149 247)

Bruce, J. *The Status of Distributive Education Programs in the Public High Schools of Texas in 1967-68.* Ed.D. dissertation, Waco, Texas: Baylor University, 1968.

Brunner. W. *Identification of System Inputs and Outputs for Minnesota Two-Year Community College Marketing Programs*. Ph.D. dissertation, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1977.

Bryan, G. "Federal Aid - Expenditure or Investment?" *American Vocational Journal*. 45(January, 1970): 24-26.

Buckner, L. and Gildan, K. *A Followup Study of the 1971 and 1972 High School Distributive Education Students in Florida.* Boca Raton: Florida Atlantic University, 1978.

Cress, R. *Evaluation of Service Station Attendant - Auto Care Project*. Lansing, Michigan: Pine Lodge Halfway House, 1973. (ED 094 168)

Cushman, R. *The Relationship Between Selected Characteristics of Secondary Distributive Education Programs and Initial Job Employment or College Entrance*. Ed.D. dissertation, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Temple University, 1973.

Daggett, W. *Selected Distributive Education Teacher Characteristics as They Relate to the Retention of Graduates in the Field of Distribution in New York and Pennsylvania*. Ed.D. dissertation, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Temple University, 1974.

Davis, E. *An Investigation of Georgia's Distributive Education and Vocational Office Training Programs in Terms of the High School Principal's Perceptions*. Ed.D. dissertation, Athens: University of Georgia, 1977.

Domian, J. "Well-Trained DE Students Can Cope." *American Vocational Journal*. 49(March, 1974): 45-47.

Dominick, F. *The Relationship Between Distributive Education Co-Op Preparation at Detroit High Schools, Post High School Occupations, and Incidences of Promotion*. Ed.D. dissertation, Detroit, Michigan: Wayne State University, 1973.

Egan, R. and Loveless, A. *The Distributive Education Curriculum as Evaluated by Businessmen and Distributive Education Students of Utah.* Salt Lake City: Utah Research Coordinating Unit for Vocational and Technical Education, 1968. (ED 021 135)

Faehnle, R. *An Analysis of the Effect of High School Cooperative Distributive Education Upon Academic Achievement in Undergraduate College Marketing*. Ph.D. dissertation, Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green State University, 1976.

Frunzi, G. *A Study of the Relationship Between Management Understandings, Distributive Education Curriculum and Certain Personal Factors of DE Seniors in Selected Delaware High Schools.* Ed.D. dissertation, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Temple University, 1977.

Gildan, K. *A Study of Graduates of Distributive Education Middle Management Programs at Nine Community Colleges*. Ed.D. dissertation, Boca Raton: Florida Atlantic University, 1975.

Gleason, J. *The Relationship of Sex and Selected Distributive Education Program Variables with Entry into Distributive Occupations After High School Graduation.* Ph.D. dissertation, Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1979.

Goodenough, L. *An Evaluation of the Marketing Program in General College at the University of Minnesota*. Ed.D. dissertation, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1969.

Gold, F. A Comparison of Selected Criteria for Distributive Education Program Operation with Practices in New York City Public High Schools. Ed.D. dissertation, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Temple University, 1976.

Gordon, J. An Assessment of New Jersey Distributive Education Programs as Perceived by Teacher/Coordinators and Principals. Ed.D. dissertation, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Temple University, 1978.

Grandfield, R. A Cost Analysis of Distributive Education Programs in Selected Delaware High Schools. Ed.D. dissertation, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Temple University, 1972.

Harris, R. and White, T. "Profiles of Small-City D.E. Program Graduates." DE Today. 8(Winter, 1975): 6-7.

Hephner, T. A Study of Attitudinal Differences Between Cooperative Distributive Education Students and General or Academic Students of Similar Backgrounds Toward Retailing as a Career Goal. Ph.D. dissertation, Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1972.

Hlebichuk, J. The Relationship of Selected Teacher-Coordinator, Program, and Student Variables to the Placement Status of the 1970 Secondary Cooperative Distributive Education Graduates in the State of Montana. Ed.D. dissertation, Bozeman: Montana State University, 1971.

Hutt, R. Perceptions of Employers Regarding Cooperative Distributive Education Programs at the Secondary Level. Ph.D. dissertation, E. Lansing: Michigan State University, 1975.

Iwler, I. A Study of the Status of Distributive Education in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 1969-70. Ed.D. dissertation, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: University of Pittsburgh, 1970.

Karp, F. A Survey of Distributive Education and Non-Distributive Education High School Seniors: Their Attitudes Toward Business and Their Knowledge About the American Economic System. Chicago, Illinois: Sears Merchandising Research, 1974.

____. A Survey of Distributive Education Teachers: Their Attitudes Toward Business and Their Knowledge About the American Economic System. Chicago, Illinois: Sears Merchandising Research, 1975.

Lamuth, D. A Comparative Analysis of Distributive Education Programs in High Schools and Area Vocational-Technical Schools in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 1973-74. Ph.D. dissertation, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: University of Pittsburgh, 1975.

Little, M. Objectives and Evaluative Criteria for Distributive Education Programs at the Secondary Level in Michigan. Ph.D. dissertation, E. Lansing: Michigan State University, 1978.

Lucas, S. et al. Assessment of Distributive and Office Education Programs: A Multivariate Analysis of Employees and Employer Satisfaction. Paper presented at the annual conference of the AERA, Washington, D.C., 1975. (ED 113 367)

Miles, B. The Measurement of the Perceptions of Distributive Education as a Training Program Held by Distributive Education Students and Training Sponsors. Ph.D. dissertation, Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1971.

Murphy, D. Determination of the Extent to Which Distributive Education Trained Work Experience Students Utilize Accepted Retail Sales Techniques in Comparison with Non-Distributive Education Trained Retail Salespeople. Ed.D. dissertation, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Temple University, 1975.

Palmieri, D. The Relationship Between Distributive Education Co-op Preparation at Detroit High Schoools, Post High School Occupations, and Incidences of Promotion. Ed.D. dissertation, Detroit, Michigan: Wayne State University, 1973.

Patton, J. An Appraisal of the Effectiveness of the Pilot Merit Awards Program in Distributive Education. Ed.D. dissertation, Knoxville: University of Tennessee, 1971.

Pride in Vocational Education and Guidance State Report 1972-73. Columbus: Ohio State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, 1973. (ED 113 578)

Righthand, H. A Follow-Up Study of Connecticut Distributive Education Graduates of the Classes of 1965-1968-1971. Hartford: Connecticut State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, 1977.